

The THE *Debate*
CASE STATED
Int. between the *Partes*
CHURCH of ROME
and the
CHURCH of ENGLAND
in a *man*
SECOND CONVERSATION
betwixt a
ROMAN CATHOLICK LORD,
and a
GENTLEMAN of the CHURCH
of ENGLAND.

The SECOND PART.

*Be ready always to give an Answer to every Man, that
asketh you a Reason of the Hope, that is in you.
1. Pet. 3. 15.*

Printed Anno 1721.



THE SECOND
 CONVERSATION
 BETWIXT A
 ROMAN CATHOLICK LORD,
 AND A
 GENTLEMAN
 OF THE
 CHURCH of ENGLAND
 CONTINUED.

§. I.

Of the Virtue, and Efficacy of the Sacraments.

Lord. **S**R, as we were last Time upon the Point of Parting, you were pleased to tell me, that *France remains still in the Dreggs of the Corruptions of Rome*; and amongst those Dreggs you reckon'd *Confession* for one. Well, Sr, if *Confessing* our Sins be among the *Dreggs of Corruption*, I must own the *Reformation* has effectually

A 2

purged your Church of it: And the Drudgery of Satisfaction, which according to Protestant Doctrine is Derogating from the infinite Satisfaction of Christ, is purged away with it.

Blessed Reformation! Which has deliver'd her Children from the Popish Yoke of Confessing their Sins, and Doing Penance for them! 'Tis true, this was the Old Way of Going to Heaven after the Loss of Baptismal Grace. For which End the Solemn Fast of Lent, besides double the Number of other Fasting Days were commanded by the Church, and innumerable Religious Houses were set up to serve as Sanctuaries for Repenting Sinners. But who would have cared one Farthing for the Reformation, if this Old Way had been kept up? 'Twas therefore wisely done to remove these Obstacles to that Godly Work by perswading the People, that Confessing and Punishing their Sins, as Papists do, are but unnecessary Ceremonies, and that the Way to Heaven is both easier and safer without them. However I have heard you say sometimes, that Confession is a good Thing, if rightly used.

» G. And I say so still: but not in that Sense, it
 » is generally used with you, and is express'd in
 » your *Catechism ad Parochos de Pœnitentia Sacramento*.
 » Sect. 46. 47. That such a Repentance, as God will
 » not accept nor pardon for it, is made sufficient
 » by the Sacrament of Penance, and all our Sins re-
 » mitted by it: and that *paucissimi*, very few can be
 » saved without it; they might have said, None. For
 » they here require in Repentance acceptable to
 » God a Sense and Sorrow for Sin, that shall be fully
 » equal to the Demerit, *ut cum scelerum magnitudine*
 » *aquari conferrique possit*; which is impossible for
 » Mortal Man: And therefore all must be damn'd
 » without the Sacrament of Penance. pag. 109.

L. I fear, Sr, there are but few saved without it; nay most certainly none of those, who are willfully out of the *Pale* of the *Catholick Church*; because the *Repentance* of such can never be *sincere*. However, to come to the *Words* of the *Catechism*, tho you have quoted them fairly, you have translated them very unfairly. For the *Word conferri* (which you have omitted in your Translation) *mollifies* and *explains* the *Word equari*; and shews it to import not a *full Equality*, as you have render'd it in *English*, but an *Equality of Proportion*. So that the Meaning of the *Catechism* is no other, than that our Sorrow must be such, that it may be *compared with*, and *bear a Proportion* to the Grievousness of our Sins; which is not impossible by the Help of God's Grace.

'Tis likewise true what the *Catechism* says, that there is a *twofold Contrition*, or Repentance: One *perfect*, that is suffices to obtain the full Pardon of our Sins without the *Sacrament of Penance*; tho it always implies a *sincere Desire* of it: But whether there be *few* or *many*, that have this *perfect Contrition* is all a *Guess*, and known to God alone. But there is another *Contrition*, or Repentance of a more *imperfect Nature*, yet it is *heartly* and *sincere* not only as to it's *Detestation of past Sins*, but likewise as to it's *Purpose of Amendment* for the Time to come. This the *Catechism* says is insufficient to blot out Sins without the *Sacrament*; yet is a sufficient *Preparation* to it. Nor do I see any Thing you can reasonably object against it.

G. My Lord, the *Catechism* says, it was necessary that God should institute this Sacrament as an *easier Way* for Men to get to Heaven.

L. Pray, Sr, can any *Christian* doubt, but that *Christ* has instituted the *Sacraments* as *Means* to facilitate our *Way* to Heaven?

» G. My Lord, you interrupted me: the Word
 » of the *Catechism* are there. *Quare necesse fuit, ut cle-*
 » *mentissimus Dominus faciliori ratione communi hominum*
 » *saluti consuleret.* An easy Way indeed! Confess to
 » a Priest, and get *Absolution*, and this makes up
 » the *Defects* of your *Repentance*, and you are saved
 » *ex opere operato*, by the Work wrought, the bare
 » Performance of this *Sacrament*. And the *Council*
 » of *Trent* anathematizes all those, who say, that
 » the very *Sacraments* of the Gospel do not conferr
 » *Grace* in the same Manner by the bare Perfor-
 » mance. *Si quis dixerit per ipsa nova legis Sacramenta ex*
 » *opere operato non conferri Gratiam----- Anathema sit.*
 » Sess. 7. Can. 8. It is true, that God did institute
 » his *Sacraments* as *Means of Grace* (for which we
 » bless his Name daily in our general Thanksgiving)
 » but this turns them into *Charms*, when the very
 » *Sacraments* themselves, *ipsa Sacramenta*, conferr
 » the *Grace ex opere operato*, by the bare Perfor-
 » mance of the Work. pag. 110.

L. Sr, I heartily subscribe to the *Definition* of
 the *Council of Trent*, and join with it in Pronoun-
 cing *Anathema* against all that deny it. But, Sr, you
 are not quite so much out of the Way as you will
 needs appear to be. For you grant the *Thing*, and
 only quarrel with the *Expression*, to have the malig-
 nant Pleasure of Lampooning *Popery*.

You say, 'tis true, that God did institute his *Sa-*
craments as *Means of Grace*; we say the same. Because
 Almighty God, who can make us become Partakers
 of his *holy Grace* by what *Means* he pleases, has
 thought fit to institute certain outward and vi-
 sible Signs, which we call *Sacraments*, to serve as
Means to convey it to us. And because they do
 this independently of the *Holiness*, the *Merits*, or *Faith*
 of the *Minister*, they are said to conferr *Grace ex*

opere operato, that is, by that *Virtue* or *Efficacy*, which *Christ* gave them in their *Institution*. And if you will needs call this a *Charm*, you are free to please yourself with the *prophane Fancy*. But if you will stand to it in good earnest, I shall make you sensible, that you bespatter yourself with the Dirt you throw at us. Pray, Sr, is not *Baptism* a *Sacrament*?

G. Who doubts it?

L. Well, Sr, let us suppose the *Minister*, who baptizes a *Child* to be an *Heretick*, or a wicked *Man*, will not the *Baptism* be *valid*, and the *Child* receive the full *Grace* of the *Sacrament*?

G. I cannot deny but he will.

L. I know you cannot deny it, unless you will renounce your 26th *Article of Religion*. But here, Sr, you are trapann'd into the *opus operatum* of the *Council of Trent*, which you nickname a *Charm*. For the *Minister* being supposed to be an *Heretick*, or a wicked *Man*, and the *Child* being void of *Reason*, the *Baptismal Grace* he receives must be attributed wholly and solely to the *Virtue* and *Efficacy* of the *Sacrament*. So that the *Sacrament* itself conferr's *Grace* by the bare *Performance* of the *Work* according to *Christ's Institution*: that is, independently either of the *Holiness* of the *Minister*, or *Cooperation* of the *Child*: And if you call this *Turning it into a Charm*, 'tis a *Charm* of *Divine Institution*, and I hope both *Priests* and *Parsons* may make *Use* of it without *Danger* of becoming *Conjurers* or *Magicians* by it.

G. Then I presume, My Lord, you require no more *Preparation* for the *Sacrament of Penance*, than a *Child* is capable of for the *Sacrament of Baptism*: that is to say, none at all.

L. Sr, you cannot be such a *Stranger* to our *Doctrine* as to think so. We require a *diligent Exa-*

mination of Conscience, a sincere Repentance, and an humble Confession. And therefore your Comment upon the Catechism; viz. that we need but confess, and get Absolution, and we are saved by the bare Performance of the Sacrament, is a rank Calumny, and you know it to be one; because you cannot but know that all our printed Catechisms, and Books of Instruction to prepare People for the Sacrament of Penance, tell them positively, that to receive a profitable and valid Absolution, they must have a true Sorrow for their Sins, and a sincere Purpose not only to abstain for the future from Sin, but the very Occasions of it. And is this barely Confessing, and Getting Absolution, as you have both falsely and maliciously represented the Matter?

G. But, if the Preparation you speak of be really required, pray, My Lord, what becomes then of the Doctrine of *opus operatum*?

L. Sr, the Doctrine of *opus operatum* is in no Danger of being prejudiced by it; because as Original Sin is remitted by the very Virtue and Efficacy of the Sacrament of Baptism, so are actual Sins remitted by the very Virtue and Efficacy of the Sacrament of Penance: But with this Difference, that a Child can put no Obstacle to the Grace of Baptism; whereas the Efficacy of the Sacrament of Penance is certainly obstructed by Impenitence: And therefore a sincere Repentance, and Purpose of Amendment are Conditions indispensably requisite to qualify a Sinner for the Benefit of Absolution, which is the peculiar Grace of that Sacrament. But it do's not produce this Grace but in Souls worthily disposed, that is, in Souls, which bring no positive Obstacle to it; and in these it infallibly produces it, whether it be administer'd by a Saint, or a Reprobate: which is the true, and a clear Explication of the Doctrine of *opus operatum*. But they
are

are Popish Words; and therefore tho' their true meaning cannot be disputed, they must be condemned and ridiculed by a true Son of y^e Church of England.

G. My Lord, let us exemplify this matter by the use made of the Institutions of God under the Law. Tho' they had got a Notion of the *opus operatum*, that the bare performance of y^e Letter of the Law in their Sacrifices, Washes, Fasts, & other Observances, was all y^t was required of them. pag. 110. cc

L. Had they so, S^r! Then they had got a very wrong Notion.

G. Whence the Voices of all the Prophets were against these Institutions. They call them Iniquity, Abomination, and hateful to God. pag. 110. 111. cc

L. What, S^r was the Voice of y^e Prophets against the Institutions themselves! I presume you mean the Abusers of them, pray, S^r, Explain your self.

G. Nay God denies y^t he did require them, or ever institute them; that is, as a dead Carcase without a Soul, and working like Charms by the bare *opus operatum*. God did never institute such, nor require them at our Hands. pag. 111. cc

L. Very right, S^r, God never ordain'd his Holy Rites or Sacrifices with an Intention, that they should be prophand, or made use of as magical Charms; but that himself should be honoured and worshipp'd by them. What then?

G. And may we not say, no more under the Gospel than the Law? For y^e Gospel introduced a more pure and spiritual worship. But the Council of Trent by naming only 2 Sacraments of the New Law applies the *opus operatum* to them also, if not chiefly. pag. 111. cc

10

L. You should say to y^e Sacraments only. For they alone confer Grace ex opere operato. But I perceive those terrible words have frighten'd you both out of good Sense, and good manners. For otherwise you would not make this ridiculous Parallel between the Jews and us, viz. that as y^e Jews plac'd their hopes of salvation in the bare Performance of the ceremonial Law, tho' their lives were most wicked, so Roman Catholics do the same with Relation to the Sacraments of the New Law. This, S^r, is the charitable Drift of your Discourse: tho' there be not a falsehism, or Book of Instructions for Receiving the Sacraments, but directs y^e foulness of the Affection, by declaring positively, that the Abuse of the Sacraments is a most grievous Sin, and that the unworthy Receiver gets nothing but Damnation to himself by it. But let me tell you, S^r, that Samponing the Sacraments, and Rejecting the greatest Part of them is a Sin of as black a Die, as to receive them unworthily.

§. 2.

of Roads.

G. My Lord, 'tis plain, that your Doctrine of Opus operatum runs through all your Devotions.

- » What else is the meaning of Tying men up to
- » the repetition of such a precise Number of Ave's
- » Pater's and Creed's at such particular times, &c.
- » then the mind go along with them or not? For
- » you will see people in the markets Buying and
- » Selling, or Discoursing of common Business,
- » and dropping their Roads all the while, to keep
- » Count, if they have rightly perform'd their
- » Task of the Opus Operatum. pag. 111.

L. This Opus Operatum sticks strangely on your stomach; yet you know not what to do without it in the Sacrament of Baptism, as I have plainly shew'd.

As to what you tell me, that we lay men up to the Repetition of such a precise Number of Aves, and Paters, and Peads at such particular times, I know of no such Obligations laid upon any by the Church: for the Beads are a Devotion principally design'd for those, who cannot read, and every one is free to use or not use it just as he pleases.

However I can see no Harm in repeating, & saying Prayer often over provided the mind go along with it. But this, you say, is not required. Pray, I, be pleas'd to read our Books of Instruction concerning the Duty of Prayer, and they will inform you better. But at the same time look over the Table of Sins, and you will find the Sin of Stander amongst them.

What you add, viz. that we may see people in the Markets Buying and Selling, or Trafficking of common Buysings, and Dropping their Beads all the while, will not clear you from y^e Guilt of Stander. First, because the people do not always as they are taught. And really, because people that attend the Markets, have many broken intervals of time, which they may employ very piously in repeating some short Prayers. I hope at last you will own y^e even in y^e greatest Hurry of Buysings Dropping of Beads is better than Dropping of Calks and Surset; which is but too much practis'd both in Shops and Markets on this side of the Bas. But if I should insinuate, that this is done by Principle and y^e Doctrine of your Church, would you not wash me up for a Liar?

§. 3.

Of Blessings, and Consecrations.

"G. But, my Lord, if Prayers and Sacraments
 "which are Means of Grace of God's own Insti-
 "tution may be abused, and render'd hateful to
 "God, what shall we say of those Means of Grace,
 "which ^{are} of Man's mere Invention? pag. 111.

L. Sir, if you speak of Means of Grace strictly
 taken, such as the Sacraments, I am wholly
 ignorant of any, that are of Man's mere Invention.

"G. None can appoint the means but he, who
 "has the Bestowing of the End to be obtain'd by
 "those means. As, if I have a thousand Pounds to
 "bestow, I may put what Conditions I think fit,
 "and appoint the means for obtaining it. Now
 "Grace is the Gift of the Holy Ghost, and none
 "can appoint the means of obtaining it, but who
 "has the Bestowing of the Holy Ghost, which it
 "is the highest Blasphemy for any Creature
 "to assume to himself. Hence Christ's Sending
 "the Holy Ghost is a sure Proof of his Divinity,
 "pag. 111. 112.

L. Sir, all this is very true, If you mean, that Christ
 alone has the Power of Instituting Sacraments.
 For this is the Express Doctrine of our Church.
 But what do you infer from it?

"G. My Lord the Church of Rome takes upon
 "her to appoint Means of Grace many & Various.
 "The Pontifical is made up of the Forms of con-
 "secration of every Thing almost one can think
 "of into means of Grace, as Bells, Books, Candles,
 "Water, Salt, Oil, Ashes, Palms, Swords, Banners
 "and Vestments of divers Sorts, even of Children's
 "Cloths; Rosaries, Pictures, Images, Agnus

S. 3.

Dei's, &c. by the Use of which in the manner &c
prescribed several Graces both ghostly & bodily &c
are s. to be obtain'd, as besides the favour of &c
God, and the Remission of Sins, the saving &c
from fire, from Diseases, from Storms & &c
Thunder, Lightning, and Tempests at Sea; &c
at which Time they Ring the consecrated &c
Bells to allay the Winds, and chase away these
Dæmons of the air, who seeing & sign of these
Proofs upon such Bells, and hearing their sound &c
shall be frighted and fly away, as it is ex- &c
pressed in the Form of Consecration of Bells &c
in the Pontifical. May there is nothing in these
Words so insignificant, a Rose, or a feather, &c
which the Pope may not consecrate into a &c
means of Grace, and is in Use every day. And at &c
Rome they are counted Atheists, who have not &c
Faith in those things, so much they place their &c
Religion in them. pag. 112. 113.

L. Before I give a direct Answer to this Poem, I
make bold to ask, whether y. Dissenters will not
object many Prayers of the same Nature ag
your Church?

G. But without Ground. For we consecrate &c
no Creatures

L. Sir, you forget yourself: But I shall re-
fresh your memory immediately.

G. Nor do we attribute any Virtue ghostly, &c
or bodily to y. Use of them. They are used purely &c
for Decency and order, and we may change them, &c
or take them quite away, as our Governours &c
think fit. pag. 113. &c

L. So may the Governours of our Church, if
they think fit, Change or take away y. Prayers,
you are pleas'd to find fault with. But for all
that I fancy you would think that man some-

what Atheistically inclined, who should venture to Lampoon, and very impertinent, if he should pretend to reform the Rites and Ceremonies of yr. Church; which perhaps appear as ridiculous to Dissenters, as some of ours do to you.

"G., But can they show any outward Action or
"thing appointed in our Church, by the use of
"which evil spirits may be chased away, Women
"helped in Labour, or Storms at Sea quelled?...

L. I really believe they cannot. The evil spirit may possess as many good protestants as heres-pleasers, without being melted or disquieted by any Parson for it. They are all so just, as to give the Devil his due.

"G. But all these and as many more virtues
"are attributed in your Church to the use of what
"they call Holy Water, and many other such
"like institutions of mechanical means of
"Grace. pag. 113.

L. S^r. As for means of Grace strictly taken, I know no such means but the Sacraments themselves instituted by Christ: Because these alone by Virtue of their Institution confer Grace ex opere operato, when no willfull Obstacle is put to it. But there are many more means of Grace, if we take the word in a larger sense. Thus Praying, Fasting, and Giving Alms are means of Grace, because they move God to bestow his Grace upon us. Thus likewise hearing Sermons, Reading pious Books, Doing good Ex-amples, or a moving Picture of our Saviour's sufferings may in a large sense be call'd means of Grace, because they excite us to y^e Practice of Virtues, by which we obtain an Increase of Grace: And if some Dissenters should ridicule these, and call them mechanical means of Grace, I believe you would have no great Opinion of his Morals for it.

But, S^r, you own your self y^e Prayer is a means of Grace. The Sacraments therefore

S. 3.

are not the only Means of Grace in the large
Senses I speak of: for Prayer is no Sacrament.

C. But, my Lord, I hold you at the same Time,
that Prayer is a Means of Grace of Gods own
Institution.

L. You did so, and 'tis very true, if you speak
of Prayer in general. But I know of no par-
ticular Form of Prayer but one, viz. the Gods
Prayer expressly commanded by Christ. The rest
are left to the Prudence and Devotion of the
Church, which either orders them to be compo-
sed, or approves them, when composed by pri-
vate Persons. Now, Sir, all Blessings, Hallowings,
Considerations, or call them what you please,
are but so many different Forms of Prayer
ordained by the Church to implore Gods Blessing
for such or such an End in the lawful Use of
his Creatures; and if 'tis an allowable, nay a
Religious Practice in some things, as I shall
properly shew, you must grant it is from
the Practice of your own Church. I see no
Reason, why it should be ridiculed in others.

But first let us see, what Encouragement
the Practice of the Roman Catholic Church in
Blessing inanimate Things has from the word
of God itself. And here occurs to me first the
Solemn Dedication, or Consecration of the Temple
of Solomon. And Atheists may call this making
a Church a Mechanical Means of Grace. But
this Custom of Blessing, and Considering -
Churches (which I think are inanimate things
as well as Bells, Books, Candles, &c.) was the
constant Practice of the Catholic Church
even in her purest Times, as all men of learn-
ing know.

But what do you think of the waters of Ba-
:lois, by the due Use whereof clandestine Adu-
tery was discovered? Numb. 5. The Show Bread,
which is call'd hallow'd or holy Bread? I am.

C. 21. v. 4. 6. The Salt used by Elisha for sweetening ^{&c.} infected waters of Jerico. 2 Book of Kings. 2. C. 2. The Silver of the fish taken by ^{&c.} Angel Raphael for expelling the Devil? Job. 1. The Clay and Waters of Siloam used by Christ to open the Eyes of the Blind man? Joh. 9. v. 6. 7. And lastly, the oil used by the Apostles to cure the Sick? mark. 6. v. 13.

Here are Charms, or Mechanical Means of Grace, as you call them, in Abundance authorized by the Word of God itself. And St. Paul has laid down a Principle of so large ^{an} Extent, & of frequent Blessings or Consecrations used in the Church of Rome are fully justified by it. For to tell us expressly, that every Creature is sanctified by the word of God and Prayer. 1. Tim. 4. v. 5. Now I presume Bells, Books, Candles, Water, Salt, Oil, &c. are in the Number of Creatures: They may therefore be sanctified (according to St. Paul) by the word of God and Prayer. And this answers every thing you have said, or can say against the Blessings or Consecrations contained in the Roman Pontifical, tho they were twice as many in Number.

But is it not the daily Practice of your own Church in Blessing the Bread upon the Table as liable to Buffoonery, as any of the Blessings in the Roman Pontifical? For when the Parson says Grace over a Pig or Pudding in those words, Bless us, O God, and these thy Gifts, &c. or For Sanctify these thy Gifts; I ask, whether the Pig, or Pudding be consecrated into a Mechanical Means of Grace, or not? If you say it is, you run into the Absurdity you reproach us with. If not, what you object against us, is frivolous.

I likewise find the following Prayer in your Administration of Publick Baptism. Almighty and Everliving God, whose most dearly beloved Son . . . regard us Respect the Supplications of thy Congregation. Sanctify

SANCTIFY THIS WATER to the Mystical Washing away of Sin, &c. And the Liturgy in Scotland has it thus. SANCTIFY THIS FOUNTAIN and Baptism, thou, which art the Sanctifier of all Things. If this be not a Consecration, there is no such Thing in the Roman Pontifical.

But the Ceremony of the King's Coronation is the most remarkable Piece of this kind of Popery. The History of the Coronation of King James the 2d tells us pag. 91. in the Margin, that the OIL, with which he was anointed, was SOLEMNLY CONSECRATED ON the Morning of the Coronation by the Dean of Westminster assisted by the Prebendaries. But Baker specifies the very Form of Blessing the Royal Ornaments thus. O God, the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, by whom Kings do reign, vouchsafe we beseech thee in thy Favour to BLESS THIS KINGLY ORNAMENT. Vouchsafe to BLESS and SANCTIFY THIS SWORD, which is hallowed for the Defence of thy holy Church. God, the Crown of the faithful, BLESS AND SANCTIFY THIS CROWN, so this thy Servant that weareth it, may be fill'd with thy manifold Graces. Bless O Lord, and sanctify this Ring. Baker printed London 1696. pag. 742. 743.

Here then we have Meat, Water, Oil, Cloaths, Sword, Ring, and Crown blessed, hallowed, sanctified, and consecrated according to the Practice of the Church of England. And what a Number of ridiculous Questions might here be ask'd, if a Man were but Atheistically enough disposed to do it? But jesting with Religious Matters is the very worst Sort of Buffoonery; and all I have to say to the Blessings used in your Church, is, that you ought not to ridicule in us, what you practise yourselves. The true Ground both of your Practice and ours is this; that whatever is Good in itself, may be lawfully pray'd for in

due Circumstances: And as God's *Creatures* may be *abused*, so they may be *bleß'd* to the End, that Men may use them as they ought. Thus *Images*, *Meats*, *Swords*, *Banners*, *Vestiments*, and many other Things are *bleß'd*: and none ought to find Fault with this but they, who either think that God cannot *bleß* the most *indifferent* Things, or that *Prayer* is not a proper Means to obtain his *Blessing*.

However you are under a Mistake, if you imagine that we place any *inherent Sanctity* in *inanimate* Things by their being *bleß'd*. We only trust, that whatever *Creatures* are *bleß'd* by the Church in the Name of *Jesus-Christ*, Almighty God will for his Sake render them beneficial to those, who use them with Devotion in order to the End, for which they are ordain'd.

§. 4.

The Sign of the Cross, Holy Water, and Exorcisms.

WHAT you say concerning the *Sign of the Cross* upon our *Bells* is no more a Matter of Jest, than the *Sign of the Cross* in *Baptism*; for the one is of meer *human Institution* as well as the other. But what an Age do we live in, when the *Sign of the sacred Instrument of Man's Redemption* is made a Subject of Laughter amongst *Christians*! This was one of the earliest Fruits of the blessed *Reformation*. For then it was that a *Crucifix* began to be treated in this Island with the same Marks of *Ignominy* and *Contempt*, as if it were the *Image* of some *infamous Traitor*, or Enemy of the State. And even now a Man becomes as ridiculous in *Protestant Company* by *Blessing* himself with the *Sign of the Cross*, as if he were dress'd up in a *Fools-coat*.

But was it so in the *primitive Ages*? Hear what *Tertullian* writes upon that Subject. *At every Step and every Turn; at every Coming in and Going out; if we put on our Cloaths, or change our Shoes; if we wash, if we take a Repast; if a Candel be brought into the Room; if we lye, if we sit, whatever we do, we are still Making the Sign of the Cross upon our Foreheads.* Lib. de corona militis. C. 3. And *St Cyril of Jerusalem* writes thus. *To this Day it [the Sign of the Cross] cures Diseases, chaces away Devils, and dissolves Charms of Witchcraft and Art Magick.* Cat. 13. p. 138. Here you see the Sign of the Cross not only chaced away Demons, but was a Remedy against Diseases, and *Magicall Spells*. And why then may it not have some Part of this Effect by the *Benediction and Prayer* of the Church, when it is impress'd upon Bells, as well as any other Way?

But, to omit numberless other Testimonies of the Ancient Fathers relating to this Subject, how can you read the two Passages, I have quoted, without being convinced that in Deriding our present Practice you condemn that of the *purest Ages* of the Church? You tell me, *the Dissenters can shew no outward Action, or Thing appointed in your Church, by the Use of Which Evil Spirits may be chaced away, Women help'd in Labour, of Storms at Sea quell'd.* A most wonderful Commendation! and you add immediately by Way of Reproach to us, *that all these, and many more Virtues are attributed in our Church to the Use of what we call Holy Water, and many other such like Institutions of Mechanical Means of Grace.*

Well, Sr, let us see, whether this Mechanism was not in Use amongst the *Ancients*, and what Effects it wrought. It is above eleven hundred Years, since *Holy Water* began to be used in England. This appears from *St Gregory's Epistle to St Melitus*, to whom he wrote thus. *Let the Idols be destroy'd: Let*

HOLY WATER be made; let it be sprinkled in the said Temples; let Altars be made, and Reliques placed in them: Lib. II. Epist. 76. This is an unanswerable Proof, that the *English* received the Use of Holy Water, as likewise of Reliques together with their Christianity from Rome. But it is still far more ancient. For in the Reign of Constantine, the first Christian Emperor, when the Jews by *Magical Enchantments* hinder'd the Building of a Church, we have in St Epiphanius this Blessing of Water used effectually against them by the holy Count Joseph; who after he had made the Sign of the Cross upon it pray'd thus. *In the Name of Jesus of Nazareth----- may this Water have Power against the Magical Charms and Enchantments, they [the Jews] have used; and may it restore to the Fire it's natural Force, that the House of God may be finish'd.* Which Effect it had accordingly, and forced the Jews then present to confess the Power of Christ. Epiph. Har. 30. §. 12. p. 136. 137.

I omit several other Relations of the like miraculous Effects wrought by the Use of Holy Water recorded in the Writings of the ancient Fathers. And I shall only add that the Power over Devils did not expire with the Apostles; nay that it was an ordinary Power of the Catholic Church in the third Age (tho it never was, nor ever will be in the Reform'd Churches) is evident from what St Cyprian wrote Epist. 76. *To this very Day, says he, the Devil is scourg'd, and burnt, and tormented by the EXORCISTS with human Voice, and a Divine Power.* Now, Sr, you may laugh, or proceed to something else, if you please.

§. 5.

Invocation of Saints.

G. MY Lord, that which makes up the Bulk « of the *Romish Devotions* is the *Worship* « and *Invocation of Saints and Angels*, the *Adoration* « of their *Images*, and the *Reliques of Saints* departed, « Pieces of their *Bodies*, or of their *Vestments*, &c. « to which great *Miracles* are attributed: and there- « fore they are made *strictly and properly Means of* « *Grace*. pag. 113. «

L. What, Sr, are all Things, to which *Miracles* are attributed, made *strictly and properly Means of Grace*? Then they are by Consequence made *Sacraments*; for these alone are *Means of Grace strictly and properly* so call'd. So then the *Handkerchiefs and Aprons*, which touch'd St Paul, and by which *Diseases were cured*, and *Evil Spirits chased away*. Act. 19. v. 12. were (at least whilst he lived) so many more *Sacraments*, than ever were instituted by Christ. Nay it is writ, Act. 5. v. 15. that they brought forth the Sick, and laid them on Beds and Couches, that at least the Shadow of St Peter passing by might overshadow some of them, and they might be deliver'd from their *Distempers*. So that St Peter's Shadow, for ought we know, had as good a Title to be of the Number of *Sacraments*, as any of Christ's Institution. How dangerous a Thing is it to be carried away with a violent *Prejudice*! For a Man's own *Principles* are generally forgot, and even common Sense is lost in the *Hurry*.

You tell me, that the Bulk of the *Romish Devotions* is made up of the *Worship and Invocation of Saints*, and *Angels*, the *Adoration of their Images*, &c. And I tell you, Sr, that the Bulk of *Protestant Objections* is

made up of *Misrepresentation* and *Slander* ; For the *Bulk* of our Devotions, and indeed the only *essential Devotion* of every true Christian consists in the *Worship*, *Invocation*, and *Adoration* of God through *Jesus Christ* : And we hold it to be a damnable Impiety to give *God's Wordship*, to any Creature whatsoever.

As to our *Invocation of Saints* (which is the Article, we have now chiefly before us) I shall set down the Doctrine of our *Church*, as it stands recorded in the *Council of Trent* ; whose Definitions in this as well as other *Doctrinal* Points must surely be allow'd to be the true *Standard* of our Faith. What therefore the *Council* teaches is this. *Viz. That it is good and profitable for Christians humbly to invoke the Saints, and to have Recourse to their Prayers, Aid, and Assistance, whereby to obtain Benefits of God through his Son our Lord Jesus-Christ, who is our only Redeemer and Saviour.* Sess. 25.

These are the Words of the *Council*, wherein our Doctrine concerning the *Invocation of Saints* is fully and faithfully deliver'd : and the Sum of it is, *that it is good and profitable, and by Consequence lawful to desire the Saints in Heaven to pray for us.* Whence I infer, that the Question between us if truly stated is this. *Viz. Whether it be not as lawful for Christians to desire the Saints in Heaven to pray for them, as it was for St Paul to desire the Christians upon the Earth to pray for him.* Rom. 15. v. 30. I confess I have not Penetration enough to see the *Lawfulness* of the one, and *Unlawfulness* of the other.

» G. My Lord, the Reason of the *Lawfulness* of
» the one, and *Unlawfulness* of the other is, because
» the one is *commanded*, the other *not* ; nay *forbidden*,
» as I will shew you. pag. 114.

L. Sr, I remember a good old Woman once made me this Answer, and I thought it was well

enough for her Capacity. But this I can assure you, that if you ever can bring me any tolerable Proof that we *obey God* in the *one*, and *disobey* him in the *other*, or that the *Lawfulness* of the *one* do's not manifestly infer the *Lawfulness* of the *other*, I shall freely own there is no such Thing as a *Contradiction* possible in the *World*.

ADVERTISEMENT.

Immediately after the Gentleman's last Words in his Case stated his Lordship is made to say, that it seems to be Giving greater Glory to God, and more Humility in us not to approach his Presence directly, and immediately ourselves. Which is false Doctrine, if he means, that we ought not to pray directly and immediately to God through the Mediation of Jesus-Christ. Then his Lordship draws a Comparison from the difficult Access to earthly Kings to illustrate the Nonsense he has utter'd. The Case indeed is often such with Kings upon Earth, who cannot be approach'd by every Body, but never with the King of Heaven, to whom (through our Lord Jesus-Christ) we have free Access, as often as we please. But why then do we desire the Saints in Heaven to pray for us? I answer for the very same Reason, which moved Saint Paul to desire the Faithful upon Earth to pray for him. Viz. That God may have the Honour, and we the Profit of more Prayers than our own. Now let us hear the Gentleman's Answer to his Lordship's fore mention'd Words, and wise Simile.

G. **Y**Our *Simile* will halt on all four. For God *is* nearer to us than any *Saint* or *Angel*. In *is*

» God we live and move, and have our Being. But the
 » Angels and Saints departed are at a Distance from
 » us, and we know not where to find them, or that
 » they hear our Prayers; for they are not every
 » where; that is an *Attribute of God Alone*. p. 114.

L. Sr, God is also *nearer to us*, than we are to one another, yet this hinders us not from Desiring one another's Prayers: And St Paul desired the Prayers of those, that were at a great Distance from him, tho he knew not whether his Petition would ever find them or not. However we know for certain that the *Saints departed* are in *Heaven*, where they see God *Face to Face*; and it is no idle Conjecture to say that by thus *seeing* him they know a great Deal more of us, than we know of them.

We likewise know for certain (and 'tis a Truth acknowledg'd by *your Church*, as I shall shew hereafter) that the *Saints and Angels*, who are the *Church Triumphant*, pray for the *Church Militant*, which is upon Earth. Whence it follows *first*, that our Desiring a Part in their Prayers cannot be unprofitable, as long as we are sure it is known to God, tho the *Saints and Angels* should know Nothing of it. The Reason is, because as it is an Article of our Belief, that all *Blessings* flow originally from *God alone* through *Jesus-Christ*, so in the Desires and Language of the Heart 'tis only to *God* through *Jesus-Christ*, that all our Prayers are chiefly directed, without which they would not be *strictly Prayers*. Whence it follows *2dly*, that it is the same in Effect, whether we say *Holy Peter pray for us*, or whether we pray thus, *O God grant us a share in the Prayers of St Peter*. As it was the very same in *David* to say, *praise the Lord all ye Nations*, Psalm 116. v. 1. as if he had said, *O Lord, may all Nations praise thee*. And by Consequence, tho it were true, that the *Saints and Angels*

Angels know Nothing of our *Invoking* them , tis enough , that it be known to God , when we desire them to pray for us , that is , to have a Part in the Fruit of their Prayers.

But , Sr , I only say this to let you see the Weakness of your Argument : for I am of another Judgment , and think we have no Reason to doubt but the *Saints* are acquainted with our Prayers.

Origine says expressly , that all the *Angels* and blessed Souls befriend those , that serve God , and that they know who are in his Favour. L. 8. contra Celsum. Edit. Huet. pag. 949.

This was also *St Gregory's* Opinion , who writes thus. *Because all the Saints see God , what is it they do not know there , where they know him who knows all Things ?* L. 4. Dial. C. 33.

This was likewise the Judgment of *St Paulinus* Bishop of *Nola* , when he made his Country-man address himself thus to *St Fœlix* for his lost Cattle. *Tu scis ubi sunt , qui lumine Christi cuncta & operta vides , longeque absentia cernis.* That is , *Thou knowst where they are , who by the Light of Christ sees't all Things even that are hidden , and far distant from thee.*

St Austin was of the same Opinion , when he made this Apostrophè to *St Paul*. *You reign with Christ together with him , whom you stoned [St Stephen] you both now see us , you both hear this my Discourse. I desire you both to pray for us.* Sermon. 316. ult. Edit. §. 5.

And *St Asterius* Bishop of *Amasea* in the 4th Age pray'd thus to the Martyrs. *You yourselves have formerly pray'd to the Martyrs before you were Martyrs. They heard you , when you entreated them. Now that you can hear us , grant us our Request.* Sermon. 10.

Lastly , *St Basil* discourses thus upon the 40 Martyrs. *He who is oppressed with any Trouble has recourse to these ; so has he , that is in joy : the one for a Deliverer*

rance, the other for a Continuation of his State. Here a Mother is heard Praying for her Children, or the safe Return, or Health of her Husband ----- And there is not one of them, who do's not see all Things. Orat. 20. in 40. Martyres. Tom. 1. Edit. Par. ann. 1637. pag. 459. D.

What Pity is it, that the Reformation did not come above a thousand Years sooner to reform these Popish Fathers! Who made no Scruple to invoke the Saints, and exhort others to do the same: nor had they any Difficulty to believe, that as the Prophets could foresee future Events, and see Things done at a Distance by the meer Light of Grace, so the Saints in Heaven may do the same by the Light of Glory. And 'tis this the Schoolmen call the Speculum, or Looking-glass of the Saints, wherein they see the Prayers and Necessities of those, who implore their Aid in this World.

„ G. Do they see every Thing in this Looking-glass? then they know as much as God. But if not, „ then how do we know they see our Prayers there? „ And how will this Sort with your Simile of an „ Earthly King, that the Courtier must go to the King „ to know what I desired the Courtier to ask of him? „ pag. 114.

L. Sr, as to your Simile, I yield up to you the whole Property of it, and you may do with it what you please. But as to what you say, that if the Saints see every Thing, they know as much as God, your Consequence is stark nought. For tho they should know all Facts past, present, and to come (more than which cannot be meant by the Words every Thing, when we speak of Creatures) their Knowledge would still be limited as those Things are: and, by Consequence come infinitely short of the infinite Knowledge of God, who not only knows all Things past, present, and to come, but every Thing, that is possible. But suppose

they do not know every Thing, then you ask *how we know, that they see our Prayers?* And I ask you, how you know, that they do not see them? For 'tis ridiculous, nay *Blasphemous* to say, that God cannot communicate to his *Saints* the Knowledge of our Petitions either immediately by himself, or by the Ministry of our *Angels-Guardians*, who certainly know both our Necessities and Prayers.

G. *Abraham is the Father of us all.* Rom. 4. v. 16. "and he was call'd the Friend of God. Jam. 2. v. 23. "Therefore it is likely, that he saw as far into the *Looking-glass* as another. Yet it is said. *Isa.* 63. v. 16. "That *Abraham is ignorant of us.* And are not we as ignorant of their State, and what Knowledge they have of us below? We are told, that they have no Knowledge of it. *His Sons come to Honour, and he knoweth it not, and they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not of them.* Job. 14. v. 21. pag. 115. "

L. I am sorry, Sr, I must accuse you of a *Blunder*. For not only your good Friends the *Schoolmen*, but your own *Catechism* will tell you, that in the Days of *Isaiah* and *Job* there were no *Saints* in Heaven, because Mankind was not then redeem'd; and so your Jest of *Abraham's seeing as far as another into the Looking-glass of the Saints* is quite spoil'd. However the true Meaning of *Isaiah* according to St *Jerom* is this, viz. *Neither Abraham nor Jacob will acknowledge those to be his Children, whom they know to be wicked.* Hier. in Cap. 63. *Isa.* in which Sense our Saviour speaks Math. 23. v. 12. *verily I say unto you, I know you not.*

As to the Text quoted from holy *Job*, St *Gregory* tells us, that he do's not speak there of *Saints*, but of *sensual* and *Carnal Men*, that loved this *World*, and especially their *Children* more than God. And these (according to St *Gregory*) are said by holy

Job to be ignorant in the other World of what they loved inordinately in this. *Hoc beatus Job nescire eos postmodum asserit, quod hic vehementius amaverunt.* But, Sr, why should the Saints be kept in Ignorance of what passes in this World any more than the Angels, of whom it is said, *that they rejoice over a Sinner that repenteth*? For both are upon the same Foot, as Protestants themselves own.

„ G. That is, when it pleaseth God to let them
 „ know it, or that the Sinner comes thither. But
 „ that they know of every Penitent upon Earth is no
 „ where said; nor do I know it asserted by any.
 „ pag. 115.

L. What wretched Shifts are you here put to, to answer this plain Text! First, the Angels know it, *when it pleases God to let them know it.* Very right, Sr; for to be sure, they would not know it, unless it pleased God to let them know it. But being conscious to yourself that this will not do your Business, your answer 2dly, that perhaps the Angels only know it, when the Sinner comes to Heaven. But here the Text is plainly against you, which speaks of their Rejoycing over a sinner *repenting, or doing Penance*; which has a manifest Reference to this Life. However if this will not do, then you come upon me with your *Corps de Réserve*, and answer me. 3dly, *that it is no where said, that the Angels know of every Penitent upon Earth.* But do's Christ make any Exception? And if he do's not, why will you presume to do it for him?

§. 6.

St Paul to the Coloss. 2. v. 18. 19. grossly misinterpreted by the Gentleman.

G. MY Lord, instead of the *Shoolmen's Looking-glass*, and their vain *Philosophy*, if we would look into the plain *Directions of Scriptures*, we should settle ourselves upon a much surer foundation. See then what the *Apostle* says upon the very Case in Hand. *Let no Man beguile you of your Reward in a voluntary Humility, and Worshiping of Angels, intruding into those Things, which he has not seen, vainly puff'd up by his fleshly Mind, and not holding the Head, from which all the Body by joints and Bands having Nourishment minister'd encreaseth with the Encrease of God.* Coloss. 2. v. 18. 19. And after says, v. 23. *which Things have indeed a Shew of Wisdom in Will-worship and Humility.* ----- Here is a full Answer to all your Pretensions for this *Will-worship of Saints and Angels*. For both go upon the same Foot. It is call'd *intruding into Things we have not seen*, of which we are altogether uncertain, and therefore sinful in the Practice by the *Apostles Rule*. Rom. 14. v. 23. *that whatsoever is not of Faith is Sin*. This was spoke in respect of *Meats*, but is much more so as to our *Worship*, and solemn Devotions of God.

Your Comparison of Access to an *Earthly King* is here call'd a *fleshly or Carnal Thought* Measuring God after the Manner of Men. -----

L. Hold, Sr, I told you just now, that the Comparison you speak of, is a *Pig of your own Sow*. So let it be as *fleshly and Carnal* as you please.

G. And the Result of this is no less than *Losing*

» our Reward, that is, Heaven. For it is *Forfaking the*
 » Head, which is Christ, whose Members we are, and
 » receive Nourishment from him: Not so from Saints
 » and Angels. pag. 115. 116.

L. That's very true, Sr; All our *Spiritual Nourishment* comes from Christ our Head, and not from Saints or Angels. But I never could suspect, that the Prayers of Saints and Angels (for pray remember they both go upon the same Foot) should hinder Christians from Receiving Nourishment from Jesus-Christ their Head, any more than the joint-prayers of their Fellow-Members upon Earth. Unless either Praying in Heaven be a Crime, which obstructs the Flowings of God's Grace upon the Members of his Church Militant, or Desiring a Share in those Prayers destroys the Fruit, and Efficacy, they would otherwise have.

But, before I give a direct Answer to St Paul's Words, I must do you the Justice to own, you are in no Danger of Wronging your Cause for Want of a Good Assurance. For when you talk of *Settling ourselves upon a sure Foundation*, and conclude the Text of St Paul with these big Words, that it is a full Answer to all our Pretensions for our Will-worship (as you call it) of Saints and Angels, who would imagine any Thing less, than that the Invocation of Saints and Angels, that is, Desiring a Part in their Prayers, is so clearly condemn'd by St Paul, that his Words are utterly incapable of any other Meaning, than as you pretend to understand them.

Now, Sr, to let you see, how notoriously you impose upon the Credulity of ignorant People, I shall endeavour to prove, that your Interpretation of the foremention'd Words of St Paul is both absurd and impious. I prove it to be absurd from a Principle, which I think cannot be contested, viz. that the Saints and Angels in Heaven pray to God for us. But

since Experience has taught me, that you make no scruple to question the very clearest Truths, I shall give myself the Trouble to prove it.

First, from *Zachary C. 1. v. 12.* where an *Angel* prays thus for *Jerusalem*, and the *Cities of Judah*. Then the *Angel of the Lord* answer'd and said, *O Lord of Hosts, how long will't thou not have Mercy on Jerusalem, and on the Cities of Judah against which thou hast had Indignation these threescore and ten Years.*

2dly, from this Maxim of *St Paul*, viz. *that Charity never ceaseth.* 1. Cor. 13. v. 8. That is, *thô Faith*, and many other Virtues cease in Heaven, as being inconsistent with the State of Bliss, yet *Charity*, by which we love *God* above all Things, and our *Neighbour* as ourselves, not only remains, but is undoubtedly encreased in Heaven. And therefore if *Charity* even in this *World* obliges us to be solicitous, and pray for one another's Salvation, surely the *Angels* and *Saints* in *Heaven*, whose *Charity* surpasses ours by many Degrees, cannot fail of Performing their Part in Sending up their Prayers to the *Throne of Grace* for those, who are yet *Combating* in the *Warfare* of this mortal Life, and uncertain of their future State.

This Argument is admirably well handled by *Mr Thorndike* an eminent *Protestant Writer* in his *just Weights and Measures*, C. 16. pag. 107. where he discourses thus. *All Members*, says he, *of the Church Triumphant in Heaven* according to their Degree of Favour with *God* abound also with Love to his *Church Militant on Earth*. Therefore it is certain, both that THEY OFFER CONTINUAL PRAYERS TO GOD for it's Necessities, and that their Prayers must be of great Force and Effect with *God* for the Assistance of the *Church Militant* in this *Warfare*. Which if it be true, the Communion of *Saints* will necessarily require, first, that all, &c. -----
2dly, THAT THE LIVING BEG OF GOD A PART

AND INTEREST IN THOSE PRAYERS, WHICH THEY, WHO ARE SO NEAR TO GOD IN HIS KINGDOM TENDER TO HIM WITHOUT CEASING, FOR THE CHURCH UPON EARTH.

3dly. From Psalm 91. v. 11. 12. *He shall give his Angels Charge over thee in all thy Ways. They shall bear thee up in their Hands, lest thou dash thy Foot against a Stone.* Now surely those Divine Spirits, whom God has appointed to take Care of us, and who always see the Face of the Father, which is in Heaven (Math. 18. v. 10.) cannot be so unconcern'd for the Persons under their Charge, as not to offer up their Prayers for them. Nay it is expressly writ, that the Smoke of the Incense of the Prayers of the Saints ascended up before God out of the Angel's Hands. Rev. 8. v. 4.

4thly. 'Tis beyond Dispute, that this was the Belief of the Ancient Church in her purest Times. Who doubts, says Origen, that all the Saints both help us by their Prayers, and encourage us by their Example? And again. We all dare confidently say, that Millions of holy Angels join themselves with Men of good Will when they pray and intercede for us, and are (as it were) Fellow-labourers with us in our spiritual Warfare. L. 8. contra Celsum. Edit. Huet. pag. 949.

The Centurists acknowledge this to be the Doctrine of St Cyprian, of whom they write thus. *Verily Cyprian do's not obscurely think, that Martyrs and Saints departed do pray for the Living.* Cent. 3. Coll. 84.

St Hilary writes thus. *There are according to St John Angels deputed for the Churches of Asia ----- And in the Doctrine of our Saviour, the Angels of little ones do always see the Face of God. There are (according to Raphael speaking to Tobias) Angels attending before the Divine Majesty, and offering up to God the Prayers of such as call upon them.* Comment. in Ps. 129.

§. 6. shamefully misinterpreted. 33

Tell me then (says St Chrysostom) dare you say the Lord is Dead, whose Servants tho' deceased are Patrons and Defenders of those, who command the whole Earth? Hom. 26. in Epist. 2. ad Cor.

When *Vigilantius* An. 404. deny'd the Intercession of Saints, St Jerom reply'd; if the Apostles and Martyrs pray'd for others in this World (when they were in Concern for themselves) how much more after their Crowns, Victories, and Triumphs? Moses obtain'd Pardon for 600000 Men; Stephen begg'd Pardon for his Persecutors; and since they are with Christ, will they have less Power? *Libro contra Vigilantium.*

To omit many more for Brevity's Sake, St Leo's Words are very remarkable. *We are bound* (says he) *to thank our Lord and Redeemer Jesus-Christ, who gave such great Power to him, whom he constituted Head of the whole Church, that if any Thing be well done even by us, it must be imputed to him to whom he said, and when thou art converted, confirm thy Brethren, and to whom our Lord after his Resurrection said thrice, feed my Sheep. Which now also without Doubt this Godly Pastor performs confirming us with his Exhortations, and* NOT CEASING TO PRAY FOR US, *that we be not overcome by any Temptation.* Leo Serm. 3. in Anniver. Assumpt. ad Pontificatum.

In a Word, Sir, I fairly defy you to produce the Authority of one single *Orthodox Father* denying that the *Saints* and *Angels* pray for us. I will therefore proceed to my -----

5th and last Proof of it from the Testimony of Protestant Writers. I have already quoted Mr *Torn-dike*; and the *Bishop of Oxford* in his Edition of St Cyprian p. 271. agrees exactly with him, and delivers it as the general Doctrine of his Church. *We do not doubt* (says he) *but the Souls in Heaven pray earnestly to God, that he may shew his Mercy to those, that live here.*

Bishop Mountague comes a Step nearer to us, and writes thus. *I see no Absurdity in Nature, nor incongruity unto the Analogy of Faith; No repugnance at all to sacred Scripture, much less Impiety for any Man to say, HOLY ANGEL GUARDIAN PRAY FOR US.* Treatise of Invocation of Saints. p. 97.

The Lutherans in their Defence of the Confession of *Ausbourg* infer from the foremention'd Text of *Zachary*, that *Angels pray for us.* Apol. Confess. August. de Invoc. Sanct. Fol. 179.

Oecolampadius (ad Orat. Chrysoft. de Juventio & Maximo Martyribus) writes thus. *Neither will I affirm it to be Idolatry to desire the Patronage of Saints. For the Saints in Heaven being inflamed with Charity do not cease to pray for us.*

Faber (de statu defunctorum C. 7.) writes plainly thus. *I do not doubt but the Souls of the Dead remember their Parents, Brothers, Sisters, and Kindred, whom they left behind; and pray to God, that he will also deliver them out of this Vale of Tears.*

Brentius ad Cap. 16. *Lucæ*, proposes this Question, *do the Dead then pray for the Living?* Which he answers thus. *Surely it cannot be deny'd, that they, who Live with Christ, wish well to the Church and her Members. For, if the Angels pray for us, as Zachary witnesseth, and if Christ himself prays for us to his Father, how should the Saints not be affected with Charity towards us in Christ, and through Christ?*

Lastly, the Church of England has this Collect upon the Day of *St Michael* and all Angels in the Common-Prayer Book. *O everlasting God, who hast ordain'd and constituted the Services of Angels and Men in a wonderful Order, mercifully grant, that as thy holy Angels always do thee Service in Heaven, so by thy Appointment they may succour and defend us on Earth through Jesus-Christ our Lord. Amen.* Here, Sr, your Church hopes for

Succour and Defence from the Angels; and I desire you to remember your own Maxim, that Saints, and Angels are upon the same Foot.

G. But pray, My Lord, what do you infer from this great Heap of Authorities? For here seems to be much Cry, but no Wool.

L. Sr, I infer first from this unanimous Agreement of Scriptures, Fathers, and Protestant Writers, that it is an undoubted Truth, that the Saints and Angels in Heaven pray for us. And from this Principle (which alone decides the whole Question concerning the Invocation of Saints) I infer 2dly, that your Interpretation of St Paul to the Colossians is absurd: Because it is inconsistent with common Sense to maintain, that we lose our Reward, and forsake the Head, which is Christ, by Desiring a Part and Interest in those Prayers, which by God's own Appointment the Saints and Angels offer to him without Ceasing for the Church upon Earth. What, Sr! can you believe that your Angel Guardian prays for you, and yet think it unlawful to desire it of him? Can you hope for Succour and Defence from Angels, and at the same Time believe you forsake Jesus-Christ, and lose your Reward, if you beg of them that Succour and Defence, for which Almighty God has appointed them to be our Guardians? If this be not Shocking^{to} common Sense, I confess I know not what is.

I shall now proceed to prove likewise the second Part of my Charge, viz. that your Interpretation of St Paul to the Colossians is impious. I have already produced the Testimony of several holy Fathers both of the 4th and 5th Age teaching and practising the Invocation of Saints and Angels. Nay that it was the publick Practice of those two Ages is a Thing so Notorious, that a Man must outface Evidence to deny it. However, to leave no Room to doubt of the

Matter, let Protestants themselves be Witnesses of it.

Bishop Forbes speaks in general Terms thus. *It has been a Practice*, says he, *for many Ages in the whole Church, in the East as much as in the West, and even in the North by the Moscovites* [Your great Church of Russia] *to sing this Litany for Example*, ST PETER PRAY FOR US. pag 311.

Dr Ful. (in his Rejoinder to Bristow, p. 5.) says, *I confess that Ambrose, Austin, and Jerom held Invocation of Saints to be lawful. And again (against Rhem. Test. pag. 443.) that many of the ancient Fathers held this Opinion, that Saints departed pray for us, we do not deny.*

Chemnitius a learned and zealous Lutheran maintains, that the *Invocation of Saints* was begun in publick Assemblies about the Years 370. by St Basil, St Gregory Nyssen, and St Gregory Nazianzen. In Exam. Conc. Trid. part. 3. p. 200.

Beza (Præf. Novi Test.) speaking of the Times of Cyprian, Austin, and Chrysostom, acknowledges, that then prevail'd the *Invocation of the Dead*.

The Centurists (Cent. 5. C. 6. Col. 675.) charge St Chrysostom's Liturgy with *Invocation of our Blessed Lady by Name*. And again (Cent. 4. Col. 295.) they alledge several Examples of *Prayers to Saints* in Athanasius, Basil, Nazianzen, Ambrose, Prudentius, Epiphanius, and Ephrem.

Lastly Mr Thorndike writes thus. *It is confessed*, says he, *that the Lights both of the Greek and Latin Church, St Basil, St Gregory Nazianzen, St Gregory Nyssen, St Ambrose, St Jerom, St Austin, St Chrysostom, St Cyril of Jerusalem, St Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret, St Fulgentius, St Gregory the Great, St Leo, More or rather all after that Time have spoken to the Saints, and desired their Assistance.* In Epil. par. 3. pag. 358.

This, I think, is abundantly sufficient to prove that the *Invocation of Saints* was both taught and practised by the *greatest Lights* of the *Church* in those very Ages, when she was most eminent both for *Holiness* and *Learning*; Since the Fact is so clear, that her very *Enemies* are forced to acknowledge it.

Now, Sr, this shews the *Impiety* of your *Interpretation* of St Paul to the *Colossians*. For it follows from it by a manifest, and undeniable Consequence, that all those great *Lights* and *Pillars* of the *Church*; those eminent *Saints*, whom the whole *Christian World* has ever held in Veneration both for their *Holiness* and *Learning*, it follows, I say, that they all *forsook Christ*, and *lost their Reward*: that is to say in plain *English*, that they are *all damn'd*. I really have the Charity to think you never reflected upon this Consequence. But I am very confident, that whoever reflects upon it, unless he be a *profess'd Atheist*, will detest your Saying, that the *Invocation of Saints* (which, *even our Enemies being Judges*, was taught and practised by those great Men) is *forsaking Christ*, and *Losing our Reward*.

Your Interpretation therefore of St Paul being inconsistent both with *Piety*, and *common Sense*, I hope you will allow me to give one, that agrees with both. Now 'tis manifest, that the principal Subject of the Chapter you have quoted from St Paul to the *Colossians* is to establish the *Divinity of Christ*, his Superiority over the *Angels*, and *Mediatorship* between God and Man. In him (says he) are hid all the *Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge*. v. 3. For in him dwelleth the *Fulness of the Godhead Corporally*; and ye are compleat in him, who is the *Head of all Principality and Power*, &c. v. 9. 10. Whence in the Words you have objected, the Apostle takes Occasion to warn the *Colossians* against the pernicious Doctrine of those,

who taught, that it was not *Christ* but *Angels*, who were our Mediators, and Reconcilers with God; whom therefore he justly accuses of not holding the *Head*, which is *Christ*.

This, Sr, is St *Chrysostom's* Comment upon the very Words, you have strain'd into an Objection against us. *They* (says he, speaking of those, against whose Seduction St *Paul* precautions the *Collossians*) affirm, that we ought to be reconciled to God not by *Christ* but *Angels* (in Epist. ad Col. 2. 68.) dicunt non oportere per Christum adduci nos ad Deum, sed per Angelos. Which blasphemous Doctrine the Apostle calls a *fleshy and carnal Thought*, and an *Intruding into Things we have not seen*. He likewise calls it a *Will-worship*, and a *false or affected Humility* in submitting themselves to those as their *Mediators*, and *Reconcilers to God*, who are utterly incapable of that high Office, which certainly belongs to *Christ* alone. When therefore you can prove, that our Desiring the Prayers of *Saints* and *Angels* is the *sacrilegious Worship* here described: that is, when you can prove us guilty of taking away the *Mediatorship* from *Christ*, and attributing it to *Angels*, it will then be Time enough to swagger, and tell me, that St *Paul's Words* are a full Answer to all our Pretensions for our Invocation of *Saints* and *Angels*.

G. My Lord, *Whatever is not of Faith is Sin* according to the Apostle's Rule, Rom. 14. v. 23. But it is not of *Faith* that the *Saints* hear us, therefore it is sinful in Practice to invoke them.

L. A notable Argument indeed! And to shew you the full Strength of it, I retort it thus. *Whatever is not of Faith is sin*. But it is not of *Faith*, that an absent Friend will receive my Letter, whereby I desire his Prayers, therefore it is sinful to desire by Letter the Prayers of an absent Friend. I think a

Man needs not be a Conjurer to answer either. But, to leave off Trifling, *St Paul's* true Meaning is, that whatever is done *mala fide*, that is, *against Conscience*, is *sinful* in Practice. And if you can prove, that we act *against Conscience* in Desiring the Prayers of *Saints*, then *St Paul's* Rule will be against us.

§. 7.

The Difference between a Mediator of Redemption, and a Mediator of Intercession.

G. MY Lord, God has given *Christ* to us as “ the one Mediator between God and Man, “ 1. Tim. 2. v. 5. But you have made to yourselves “ many Mediators to assist and help him, as if his “ Mediation, and Intercession were not sufficient. pag. “ 116. “

L. Sr, if *St Paul* thought the *Mediation* and *Intercession* of *Christ* insufficient, and made many Mediators to himself when he desired the Prayers of the *Romans*, Rom. 15. 30. Then we are guilty of the same Crime in Desiring a Part in the Prayers of the *Saints*. But every one, that is but well instructed in his Catechism, will tell you, that, tho there be but one Mediator of Redemption (of which *St Paul* speaks) yet all, that pray for us, may improperly be call'd Mediators of Prayer, or Intercession. I say improperly, because there is only one (to wit, *Jesus-Christ*) who can have immediate Access to God for us : and all others, that pray for us, must use his Mediation as well as we ourselves, when we direct our Prayers to God.

In this Sense therefore there are many Mediators, and whoever prays for another, mediates (as it were) between him and Almighty God. In this Sense *St Paul* teaches us Gal. 3. v. 19. that the Law was ordain'd by

Angels in the Hand of a Mediator, which Theodoret says was *Moses*. Tom. 3. pag. 276. And *Moses* said thus of himself, *I stood between the Lord and you at that Time*. Deut. 5. v. 5. In this Sense the *Lutheran Profession of Wittenberg* says, Tit. de ordine. If we mean a Mediator of Prayer, every good Man is another's Mediator through *Jesus Christ*: because it is every Man's Duty to recommend the Salvation of others by Prayers to God. This is our Doctrine clearly and fully explain'd.

Bishop Mountague speaks the same Language in antidot. pag. 10. *I do not deny* (says he) *but the Saints are Mediators* (as they are call'd) *of Prayer and Intercession* ----- *They interpose with God by their Supplications*; and mediate by their Prayers. And again in his Treatise of *Invoc.* pag. 118. he says of us: *I grant Christ is not wrong'd in his Mediation*. It is no impiety to say as they do, holy Mary pray for us, holy Peter pray for me. This worthy Protestant will, I hope, teach you some Moderation, and make you blush at what you just now told me, viz. *that we make to ourselves many Mediators TO ASSIST AND HELP CHRIST, as if his Mediation and Intercession were NOT SUFFICIENT*; which is *Wronging Christ* in the highest Degree.

» G. My Lord, you make more Applications to
» Saints, than to Christ, or to God himself. You
» have ten *Ave Marias* for one *Pater noster*. pag.
» 116.

L. Sr, every Prayer, by which I invoke the Saints has it's principal Tendency to God, since I only desire them to pray to him for me: and 'tis from him alone I expect the Blessings, for which I desire the Assistance of their Prayers. So that ten *Ave Mary's* are in Effect ten Petitions to God for such or such a Favour through the Intercession of his blessed Mother. And is not this a most grievous Scandal!

G. My

G. My Lord, you have multiplied your *Saints* without Number like *Heathen Deities*, and new Canonizations are going on every Day. pag. 116. "

L. But, Sr, are *Saints* the worse for being many in Number? Or are you afraid the *old ones* will be forced to quit their Place in Heaven to make Room for *New-comers*? I assure you, Sr, no *Protestant Saint* will be a sufferer by it. Your pretty Comparison shall be consider'd immediately.

G. Every Country, City, Parish, and almost Person have a particular *Saint* for their *Patron*. p. 116. " 117. "

L. So much the better, Sr, I am glad to hear it. Every Man has his *Angel-Guardian* to succor and defend him: and if he has besides a *Saint* to pray for him, is there any Harm in it?

G. You have *Saints*, as the *Heathens* had *Gods* for the Sea, for the Air, Fire, &c. for Peace, for War, for Learning, for all Sorts of Trades and Occupations. pag. 117. "

L. But with this Difference at least, that the *Heathens* not only made *Gods* of most wicked and flagitious Men, as *Drunkards*, *Robbers*, *Whore-mongers*, &c. but offer'd *Sacrifice* to them, which is due to God alone: and we only implore the *Prayers* of Persons, whose *Holiness* and happy State nothing but the blackest Malice can question.

G. St *Christopher*, and St *Clement* are for the Sea, especially the *Virgin Mary*, to whom the *Seamen* sing *Ave maris stella*. pag. 117. "

L. Well, Sr! and is not that much better than Cursing and Swearing in the Midst of a Storm?

G. St *Agatha* is for the Fire, and they make Letters on her Day to quench Fire with? pag. 117. "

L. Sr, I suspect this Story comes out of some *Protestant Mint*; and I should be glad to know the

Country or Town, where this is practised, and allow'd of.

» G. St Nicholas and St Gregory are for Schollars,
 » St Luke for Painters, &c. And you have Saints for
 » all Diseases. St Cornelis cures the Falling Sickneß,
 » St Apollonia the Tooth-ach, St Roche the Pox, &c.
 » pag. 117.

L. The Pox do you say ? For Shame, Sr ! The Plague you should have said. But it is no Sin to belye the Church of Rome. Go on.

» G. Your People have Particular Saints for all
 » Beasts and Cattle. St Eloy presides over the Horses,
 » and St Antony over the Swine, &c. and they bring
 » their Cattle to be blessed by these Saints on their
 » particular Days. And they pray to these Saints
 » jointly with God. A Schollar says, God and St Ni-
 » cholas be my Speed. And when one sneezes, God help
 » you and St John. And to a Horse if he stumbles, God
 » and St Eloy save thee. And upon every Surprize they
 » cry, Jesus Maria: pag. 117.

L. Surely, Sr, it shews a much more pious Disposition to cry Jesus Maria, than God damn me upon every Surprize. But as to the other fine Saying mention'd by you, I cannot imagine where you have pick'd them up. For I have conversed with many Schollars in my Life-time: I have also heard many a Man Sneeze, and seen many Horses Stumble; yet I cannot remember I ever heard any of the Prayers you mention. But let it be so; where is the Harm in Calling upon God, and St Nicholas or any other Saint at the same Time? The Saints are united to God in eternal Bliss; and if I join them together in my Thoughts, or name them together in my Prayer; that is, if I pray God, and invoke his Saints at the same Time, I hope 'tis better at least than Lampooning God in his Saints.

G. My Lord, to pray to the *Saints* jointly with God is somewhat too familiar, and looks like putting them upon the *Level*.

L. Ay, Sr, it would do so, if we pray'd to the *Saints* as we do to God. But if we only invoke the *Saints* as *Intercessors* at the same Time that we call upon God as the *Giver of all good Gifts*, there is no Danger of Putting them upon the *Level*. Prayer is the *Desire* or *Affection* of the *Heart*, and if the *Heart* moves at the same Time towards God and his *Saints*, or towards *Christ* and his *Blessed Mother*, as when I say, *Jesus Maria*, do's it make no Difference between the *Creator* and the *Creature*? If so, then it will be *Blasphemy* to praise God in his *Saints*: Because in that Act I must of Necessity join God and his *Saints* together. Nay I cannot praise God in his *Saints*, but in the same Act whether I will or not, I praise and Honour the *Saints* with an *inferiour* or *Relative Honour*.

What you tell me concerning St Eloy's *PRESIDING* (as you term it) over *Horses*, and St Antony over the *Swine*, is a very curious Piece of *Erudition*, to which I was an utter stranger till now.

But, to give a short Answer to this whole Piece of *Buffoonery*, we honour all God's *Saints*, because they were his faithful *Servants* on Earth, and are honour'd by him as his *Friends* in Heaven. And if the People address themselves to this or that particular *Saint* rather than others, 'tis not because there is a *Division of Offices* among the *Saints*, or that they may not all equally intercede for any Favour without Entrenching upon each other's *Prerogative*, but because (according to St Austin's Remark Epist. 78. olim 137. §. 3.) as the *Saints* have their several *Gifts* bestow'd upon them in this *Life*, so Almighty God thinks fit to honour them differently in *Heaven*, And

the People that invoke them, have found by Experience, that God is pleased to grant such or such particular Favours through their *Intercession*. But your Comparing on this score God's *Saints* with the *Heathen Deities* is a most Unchristian Reflection, because we do not honour them as *Gods*, but as the *Friends*, and *Servants* of God, of whom alone we hope to obtain the Blessings, for which we desire their Prayers.

§. 8.

St Austin Falsified.

“ G. **T**HE Word *Gods* is frequently given in
 “ Scripture to *Angels*, and to *Men* as *Minis-*
 “ *ters* of God ----

L. It is so sometimes. What then?

“ G. Thus the *Heathens* understood it, and sup-
 “ posed their *Gods* to be such *Ministers*, as *Æolus* to
 “ govern the *Winds*, *Neptune* the *Sea*, &c. Therefore
 “ they call'd them *Dii Medioxumi*, inferiour Gods,
 “ as standing in the Middle betwixt the *Supreme God*
 “ and us to succour and punish us according to his
 “ Orders. pag. 117. 118.

L. It seems then according to you, that the *Heathens* in calling those *Gods*, whom they had deified, understood that Word in a very innocent sense, and as it is sometimes taken in Scriptures for the Ministers of the true *supreme God*. Really, Sr, with a few touches more of your exquisite Skill it is to be hoped the *Heathens* will shortly be transform'd into true *Worshippers*. But they have unluckily spoil'd all, and explain'd their own Meaning in *Fact* by Offering *Sacrifices* to their *inferiour Gods* no less than to their *Supreme God Jupiter*: which is a convincing

Proof, that they regarded them all as *truly Gods*, and were blind enough to believe, that there were *Higher and Lower Degrees* amongst the *Gods* as well as amongst *Creatures*: Tho in Reality both their *Higher, and Lower Gods* were but *Devils, or evil Spirits*.

G. St *Austin*, who knew them well, tells us *what they argued for themselves*. They said, *we do not Worship evil Demons or Spirits, but we Worship those, whom you [Christians] call Angels, the Powers of the great, the Ministers of the great God.* August. in Ps. 96. But St *Austin* answer'd them, *that they must be evil Spirits, whom they worshipped, because they required Worship from Men as the Devil did from our Saviour; which the good Angels always refused.* And he quotes, *Rev. 19. v. 10. and 22. v. 9.* where the *Angel* forbid *John* to worship him. And the same did the *Saints* upon Earth; as *Peter* refused it from *Cornelius*, *Act. 10. v. 26.* And *Paul* and *Barnabas* from the Men of *Lystra*. *Act. 14. v. 14. 15. pag. 118.*

L. Sr, it is no Wonder the *Heathens* would not own their *Gods* to be *evil Spirits*. But St *Austin* upon the 96 *Psalm* quoted by you confutes them very solidly, and I am sorry I must here accuse you of a notorious *Falsification* of that *Father's* Answer to the *Heathens*. You say his Answer is thus. *Viz. That they must be evil Spirits, whom they worshipped; because they required WORSHIP from Men.*

Now the Word *WORSHIP* is *equivocal*, and may either signify *Divine Worship*, or that *inferiour or Relative Honour*, which we pay to *Saints* and *Angels*. Therefore to render it at least *doubtful*, which of the two *Worships* St *Austin* condemn'd in his Answer to the *Heathens*, you have very dexterously alter'd his Words; which, if truly quoted are *clear*, and incapable of a *double Meaning*. His true Words are

these. *Dic mihi, Dæmonia colis, an spiritus bonos, quales sunt Angeli? Sunt enim Angeli sancti, & sunt Spiritus maligni. Ego dico in Templis tuis non coluntur nisi Spiritus maligni. Qui sibi exigunt superbe SACRIFICIUM, & volunt se coli TANQUAM DEOS, maligni sunt, superbi sunt.* That is to say, Tell me do you worship Devils or holy Spirits, such as Angels are? For there are holy Angels, and there are evil Spirits: I say that in your Temples only evil Spirits are worshipped. For they, who proudly require SACRIFICE to be offer'd to them, and will be worshipped AS GODS are evil and proud Spirits.

These, Sr, are St Austin's Words upon the 96. Psalm. and your Translating them as you have done, is such a Piece of Disingenuity, as all Men of Honour and Conscience will detest. For it is manifest, and you cannot but be conscious of it to yourself, that his Words express and specify that Worship, which is OFFERING SACRIFICE, and can therefore render you no Manner of Service against our Invocation of Saints and Angels, unless you can prove, that we offer Sacrifice to 'em, and Worship them AS GODS, which the blackest Malice cannot accuse us of.

You say St Austin quotes Rev. 19. v. 10. and 22. v. 9. Where the Angel forbid St John to worship him. To which St Austin himself answers for me: that the Angel appear'd in such a Manner, that he might have been adored as God, and therefore St John's Mistake was to be corrected. Aug. Quæst. 61. in Gen.

After which you quote St Peter Refusing Worship from Cornelius. To which I answer, that tho the Worship intended by Cornelius was no more than a Respect due to St Peter's Character, he refused it out of Humility. For if what Cornelius did, was in itself unlawful, then kneeling to a Parent, or the King is likewise unlawful.

Lastly, you produce the example of *Paul and Barnabas Refusing Worship from the Men of Lystra*. *Act 14. v. 11. &c.* But do not the *Acts* themselves tell us what Sort of *Worship* these Men intended? *The Gods*, said they, *are come down to us in the Likeness of Men. And they call'd Banabas Jupiter, and Paul Mercury, because he was the chief Speaker: Then the Priest of Jupiter brought Oxen and Garlands, and would have done Sacrifice to Barnabas and Paul, &c.* And had they not then Reason to refuse *this Worship* from them? But if the *Men of Lystra* had only desired their *Prayers*, as we do those of the *Saints and Angels*, would *Paul and Barnabas* have Scrupled to grant their Request?

§. 9.

The scandalous Parallel between the Heathen Worship, and that of Roman Catholicks confuted.

ADVERTISEMENT.

After the Gentleman's last Words in his Case stated, pag. 118. his Lordship is so very ignorant as to answer, that the Heathens worshipped every one of their Gods as supreme. Which Blunder was necessary to introduce the scandalous Parallel between the Heathens, and Roman Catholicks.

I call it scandalous, 1. because Idolatry is a Crime of the blackest Nature; and nothing can be a more Scandalous Calumny, than to fix it upon so considerable a Body of Christians, as Roman Catholicks are, unless the Charge be made out with such strong and undeniable evidence, that no Man of Sense can oppose or deny it.

I call it scandalous, 2. because it Unchurches the

whole Church of Christ for many Ages before the pretended Reformation: in which Ages the Invocation of Saints was taught and practised by the whole Christian Church upon Earth, as I have already proved even from the Testimony of Protestant Writers.

Lastly, I call it a Scandalous Parallel, because it not only damns the whole Church (that was) of Great Britain for 900 Years before the Reformation, but turns all the most eminent Saints and Doctors of the primitive Ages (who all taught and practised the Invocation of Saints, as I have proved) into as rank Monsters, or Ministers of Satan, as Idolatry can make them.

Now let us have this noble Parallel. But the Reader, to understand the Connection, must remember his Lordship's wise Saying in the former Conversation, that the Heathens worshipped every one of their Gods as Supreme, and independent; to which the Gentleman answers thus.

„ G. **S**OME Men make Monsters of others to hide their own Deformity. pag. 118.

L. Sr, your Observation is very just, if it be but duly applied. For Protestants make Monsters of Papists to hide the Deformity of their own Reform'd Churches.

„ G. Your Guides have set up this Notion [viz. that the Heathens worshipped every one of their Gods as Supreme] to hinder the Parallel betwixt the Heathen Worship of their inferiour Gods, and yours of Saints and Angels. pag. 118.

L. Sr, I know nothing of the Notion you speak of; nor shall I stand in any Need of it to confute your

your *Scandalous Parallel*; which you can never make out, unless you either prove that our *Saints* and *Angels* are *evil Spirits*, as the *inferiour Gods* of the *Heathens* were; or that we *offer Sacrifice* to 'em, as the *Heathens* did to their *inferiour Deities*; or that we do not worship the *true God*.

G. My Lord; there is nothing more evident, than that the *Heathens* did acknowledge *one Supreme and true God*, tho in much Ignorance and Superstition. pag. 119. "

L. Sr, if you mean, that the *Heathens* worshipped the *true God*, there is nothing more evident, than that the *Word of God* is flatly against you in innumerable Places. I shall only quote two or three to satisfy you. *Because ALL THE GODS OF THE NATIONS are Devils, but the Lord has made the Heavens.* Ps. 95. v. 5. *They sacrificed their Sons and Daughters unto Devils.* Ps. 105. v. 37. I say, that the Things, which the *Gentiles* sacrifice, they sacrifice to *Devils*, AND NOT TO GOD. 1. Cor. 10. v. 20. And have you after this the Confidence to say, that *Nothing is more evident than that the Heathens acknowledged*, that is, worshipped the *true supreme God*!

G. My Lord, St Paul says Rom. 1. v. 19. 20. &c. That they knew God, that he was manifest unto them, even his eternal Power and Godhead. So that they were without Excuse in their foolish Imagination to change the Glory of the uncorruptible God into an Image made like to the corruptible Man, &c. And he told ---- "

L. Hold; Sr, you shall have full Liberty to proceed as soon as I have answer'd this Text. St Paul speaks here not of *Heathens in General*, but of some of the wisest amongst them, who knew God by the Light of Nature, but yet their *Worship* did not answer their Knowledge; on the contrary in Compliance

with the People they practised the rankest Idolatry. And therefore I do not like your, &c. because it *stiles* that Part of the *Text*, which utterly spoils your *Parallel*. The *Text* unmangled is thus. *Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God has shew'd it unto them. v. 19. For the invisible Things of him from the Creation of the World are clearly seen, being understood by the Things that are made, even his eternal Power and Godhead, so that they are without Excuse. v. 20. Because that when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were they thankful, but became vain in their Imaginations, and their foolish Heart was darken'd. v. 21. Professing themselves Wise, they became Fools v. 22. And changed the Glory of the uncorruptible God into an Image made like to corruptible Man, and to Birds, and four-footed Beasts, and creeping Things. v. 23. And again v. 25. he tells us, that they changed the Truth of God into a Lie, and Worshipped and served the Creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever.*

This is the *Text*; and we have here an exact Description of a Set of Men, who, tho they knew God by the Light of Nature from the wonderful Creation of the *World*, yet contrary to that Light they fell into all the foulest Practices of *Idolatry*, as Offering Sacrifice to the Statues of *Jupiter, Venus, Mercury, &c.* (which the Apostle calls, *Changing the glory of the uncorruptible God into an Image made like to corruptible Man*) nay even to the Statues of *Birds, and four-footed Beasts, and Creeping Things*: whence the Apostle concludes, that they changed the Truth of God into a Lye, and Worshipped and served the Creature more than the Creator. Both which Parts of the *Text* you have very prudently clapp'd under an *& cetera*, because they lay open the Shame of your *Parallel*, and make it look as nonsensical as it is scandalous; unless

you either prove, that we *Worship* the *Images* of *false Gods* ; or that the *Images* of *Birds* , and *four-footed Beasts* , and *Creeping Things* are *Worshipped* by us ; or finally, that we pay *Divine Honours* to the *Images* of *Christ* or his *Saints*. Now , Sr , you may go on , where you left off.

G. St Paul spoke thus to the Athenians. *Whom* *therefore* *you ignorantly Worship* , *him declare I unto* *you*. Act. 17. v. 23. Now he did not preach a *false God* unto them : but they had blended the *Worship* of *God* with these *inferiour Gods* or *Demons* , which was their *Superstition*. For so the *Word* signifies *δεισιδαιμονία* , the *Fear* of these *Demons*. And it is thus render'd every where in the *New Testament* , which we translate *Superstition*. And so the *Vulgar Latin*. Act. 17. v. 22. and 25. v. 19. And the *Latin Word* *Superstition* means the same Thing , and is derived , as *Servius* has it , from *Superstare* , as being a *Fear* of those *Heavenly Powers* , who *superstant* , stand over us : and so *Superstition* is *Superstantium rerum timor*. Others derive it from *Superstitēs* , that these *Divi ex hominibus facti* , Men *Deified* after their Death are still *Superstitēs* , and the *Fear* of them as such is *Superstition* , or , *qui superstitem memoriam defunctorum calunt* , who *Worship* the *Memory* of these *dead Men*. pag. 119. "

L. What a Deal of learned Pedantry have we here about the Derivation of a *Word* ! But to come directly to the Point , the main drift of what you have now said is to shew *first* , that the *Heathens* worshipped the *true God*. For unless you can prove this , your Parallel betwixt *Heathens* and *Papists* is most eminently ridiculous. and *2dly* , that their *Blending* or *Mixing* the *Worship* of their *inferiour Gods* or *Demons* with that of the *true God* is just what *Papists* do in *Honouring* *God's Saints* and *Angels* , and

joining it with their *Worship* of the *true God*. And so you compare our Honouring the *Saints* in *Heaven* with the *Heathen Worship* of their *Men deified* by them after their *Death*.

But, Sr, you forget yourself to be a Member of the *Church of England*, which keeps particular holy Days for the *Apostles*, *St John Baptist*, *St Stephen*, &c. and has one holy Day for all the *Saints* in general, and another for *St Michael*, and all the *Angels*. [*Case stated*, pag. 135.] Now I call this Paying a *religious Honour* or *Worship* (give it what Name you please) as we do to God's *Saints* and *Angels*. And if this be *Heathenish Superstition* in us, I should be glad to know what Name it is to be call'd by, when it is practised by *Protestants*. But I believe you will be forced to come to this Answer, that in the Religious Honour you pay to *Saints* and *Angels* by keeping their holy Days, you do not regard them as *Gods*, but as the faithful Servants and Ministers of God: nor do you offer Sacrifice to them, as the *Heathens* did to their inferiour Gods, and that therefore you cannot be accused of *heathenish Superstition* in keeping holy Days in Honour of them. But if this Answer will leave no Room for a Parallel between the *Heathens* and you, I hope it will convince you of the scandalous Nonsense of the Parallel you make between the *heathen Worship*, and ours: and it follows hence, that tho it were true, as it is most false, that the *Heathens* worshipped the *true God*, your Parallel would be defective in an essential Point.

G. Ay but, My Lord, you do not reflect that we do not pray to the *Saints* and *Angels*, as you do: and this is a material Difference.

L. Sr, it serves only to convince the World how incoherent you are with yourselves. It shews your Religion is not built upon steady Principles, but

put together by Humour and Caprice. For is it not a contradiction in Practice to scruple at Desiring the Prayers of *Saints* and *Angels*, when at the same Time you make no Scruple to keep *holy Days* in Honour of them? Neither you nor we make any Difficulty to desire the Prayers of our *Fellow-mortals* upon Earth, who are yet subject to many Failings: Yet no Church in the World was ever so extravagant as to institute holy Days in Honour of *mortal Men*. Which is a convincing Proof, that instituting holy Days in Honour of Creatures is a *religious Honour* or *Worship* of a far higher Degree than Desiring their Prayers; which is all that is meant by *Praying to Saints*. And therefore if there be no Superstition, or Breach of a Commandement in the one, there can be none in the other.

G. But, My Lord, what do you say to the Text, I have quoted from the *Acts* to prove that *the Heathens worshipped the true God*?

L. I answer, it will clear itself, if it be but set in it's own true Light: it is thus. *As I passed (says St Paul) and beheld your Devotions, I found an Altar with this Inscription, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD. Whom therefore you ignorantly worship (that is, without knowing him) him I declare unto you.* Then he proceeds to explain to them the Nature and Attributes of God, and tells them amongst other Things, *that he dwells not in Temples made with hands, nor is like unto Gold, or Silver, or Stone graven by Art, or Man's Device.* Whence I infer that the *Athenians* were wholly ignorant of the spiritual and infinitely perfect Nature of God; since St Paul was forced to instruct them in the very first Rudiments, we usually teach Children. I infer again that they worshipped meerly at Random something they knew not what: and therefore dedicated their Altar to the *unknown God*. In all

Probability they had heard the God of the *Jews* or *Christians* spoken of; and as they were fond of any new *Deity* (provided their old ones were not prejudiced by it) they immediately erected an Altar to him. And is not this an admirable Text to support your Parallel! Now let us hear what you have farther to say.

» G. My Lord, the Heathen *Worship* of their
 » lesser Gods is what is forbidden in the first Com-
 » mandement, which respects the Object of *Wor-*
 » ship, that no *religious Worship* is to be given to any
 » but to the supreme God alone. The second Com-
 » mandement relates to the Manner of *Worship*,
 » that is, by Images. But this your Church has hid-
 » den from the People, and divided the 10th into
 » two to keep up the Number, that the People might
 » think they still have the ten Commandements. And
 » it is thus in your very Catechism *ad parochos*. But
 » of this hereafter. pag. 120.

§. 10.

Of Dividing the Commandements.

L. SR, I must take your Words in Pieces to separate Truth from Falsehood. It is true that the first Commandement respects the Object of *Worship*, and forbids the *Heathen Worship* of their lesser Gods, nay of their great God *Jupiter* also. 'Tis likewise true, that it forbids *religious Worship* to be given to any but the supreme God alone; if by *religious Worship*, you mean *supreme divine Adoration*, or *Offering Sacrifice*. But if you mean, an *inferiour relative Honour*, it is false what you say; and you must grant it to be so, unless you will own the *Church of England* guilty of a Breach of the first Commandement, when-

ever she keeps holy Days for *Saints* and *Angels*, which I am sure is a *religious Honour*, or *Worship*; call it by what Name you please.

But when you tell me, that the first Commandement forbids religious *Worship* to be given to any but the *supreme God* alone, I should be glad to know, whom you mean by the *supreme God*. Do you mean the *supreme God* of the *Heathens*, or the *God* of *Christians*? For 'tis certain the *Heathens* had a *God*, whom they regarded as *supreme*.

G. My Lord, I have already told you, that *Heathens* worshipped *one supreme and true God*, and brought good Proofs for it, and I will prove it more fully hereafter. What need then of your Question, since there can be but *one supreme true God*.

L. Well then, Sr, I infer that *Jupiter*, who certainly was the *supreme God* both of the *Greeks* and *Romans*, was according to you the very same *true God*, whom *Christians* now adore; and since you now tell me, that the *Worship* of the *lesser Heathen Gods* is the Thing precisely forbid in the *first Commandement*, I conclude that according to your Doctrine it is no Breach of that Commandement to *Worship Jupiter*. What Pity is it that you have not printed a true *Protestant* Explanation of the ten Commandements!

But you tell me our Church has hid the *second Commandement* from the People, and divided the *tenth* into two to keep up the Number, and that it is thus divided in our *Catechism ad Parachos*. Sr, it is thus divided not only in that *Catechism*, but in *Sr Austin* himself *Quest. 71. in Exod.* who maintains expressly, that what you call the *second Commandement* is but a Part, or fuller Explanation of the *first*: and he divides the Commandements as we do. Yet I never heard *Saint Austin* tax'd with *hiding* the *Commande-*

ments from the People, or Designing to *put a Trick* upon them by *Making them think they had the ten Commandments*, when they had but *Nine*. I must therefore suppose the *learned Fathers*, who were contemporary with *St Austin*, or lived in the following Ages; either wanted your *Wit* to detect, or your *Zeal* to reprove so notorious a *Cheat*. But since you intend to speak of this hereafter, I shall wait for your Leisure to give a full Answer to it. In the Mean Time I desire you to remember, that the *Deadly Sin* of *Calumny* is forbid by one of the *ten Commandments*, and you may take my *Word* for it, that I will prove you guilty of this *Deadly Sin*, whenever you attempt to make good this Charge; viz. *that we hide any of the Commandments from the People*. However all Endeavours are used by the *Ministers* of your Church to possess the People with this Notion of us; and it were happy for you and many more that this Commandment, *thou shalt not bear false Witness against thy Neighbour*, had never appear'd in the *Tables* of the *Decalogue*.

I shall here only ask one Question. Viz. *Why your Dividing the first Commandment into two*, may not with equal Justice be said to have been done *to keep up the Number*, that the People might think they still have the *ten Commandments*, as our *Dividing the Tenth*? For the *Scripture* has not determined the Matter. It only tells us, that there are *ten Commandments*; but how many belong to the *first Table*, and how many to the *second*, or whether the *first* or the *Tenth* is to be divided into two, is no where specified.

What you say, viz. *that the second Commandment* (as you call it) *relates only to the Manner of Worship by Images*, is false. On the Contrary it forbids the *Worship of God* to be given to *Images*. And this is the natural Import of these Words, *thou shalt*

§. 10. *the Commandements.* 57
shall't not adore nor Worship them. Exod. 20. v. 5.
 which regards the *Object of Worship* as well as these
Words, thou shall't not have strange Gods before me;
 And surely differs very much from the false inter-
 pretation you put upon them, viz. *that they forbid*
the Worship of God by Images. For how can that be
 true, since God himself commanded the *Ark*, and
 the *Cherubins* to be made with *Respect to his Worship?*
 Or did God *command and forbid* the selfsame Thing?
 But it is somewhat remarkable, that you should
 content yourself with *barely Asserting* a Thing of that
 Moment, and without so much as *Offering* at the
 least Proof of it. The only Reason I can give for it
 is, that *Saying* is much easier than *Proving*.

ADVERTISEMENT.

The Gentleman's following Words appear to have
no Manner of Connection with what he said last.
But since they immediately follow one another in his
Case stated, the Reader must take them as they are.

§. 11.

The Parallel continued.

G. **T**He *Heathens* had their good and evil De-
mons, as their good and evil *Genii*. But ac-
 cording to St *Austin's* Rule, they must be evil De-
mons, who accepted the *Worship of Men*, which
 were all the *Heathen Demons* ----

L. Sr, I must make bold to refresh your Me-
 mory; for you have already forgot your *Falsification*
 of those *Words of St Austin*, to which you refer me.
 So go on.

G. Therefore the *Word Damon* is taken in the
 II. Part. H

» worst Sense , and translated *Devil* throughout the
 » *New Testament* : and what we translate the Doc-
 » trine of *Devils*. 1. Tim. 4. v. 1. is the Doctrine of
 » the *Demonies* , or , the *Worship of Demons* ; and a
 » various Lektion has who *Worship the Dead*. The
 » *Demonies* of the *Heathens* were their dead *Hero's* ,
 » whom they made *Divi* by their *Apotheosis* , as the
 » *Pope* do's *Saints* by a *Canonization*. pag. 120.

L. Now , Sr , I must own , your Parallel is most
 admirable. For , as the *Heathens* made *Gods* of their
 dead *Hero's* , who were most wicked *Wretches* , and of-
 fer'd *Sacrifice* to 'em ; just so the *Pope* or *Church of*
Rome declares Men eminent for the *Holiness* of their
 Lives to be *Saints* , and desires a *Part* in their *Prayers* ;
 which is just as good a *Parallel* , as is contain'd in the
 two following Verses.

*Even as in a Banquet there be many Dishes ,
 Even so your Doublet be too short for your Breeches.*

Pray , Sr , leave off this prophane Trifling , and be-
 gin to speak Sense.

» G. But it is too gross to put it upon the *Hea-*
 » *thens* that they thought every one of those *Gods* ,
 » whom they made , was the *Supreme God* , who made
 » themselves. pag. 120.

L. Well , Sr ! And who ever told you they did ?
 However , tho they did not think them all to be su-
 preme *Gods* , yet they offer'd *Sacrifice* to them as much
 as to their *Supreme Jupiter*.

» G. They own'd these to be *lesser Gods* , and only
 » the *Virtues* and *Powers* of the *Great God* : and they
 » thought , that they honour'd the *Supreme God* the
 » more by Doing Honour to his *Substitutes* , and all
 » their *Worship* was ultimately referr'd to him , so
 » that he only was *Worshipped* in all their *Gods* and *Gods*.

desſes. For they made him King of all their Gods and Goddesses. Aug. de Civ. Dei. L. 4. C. 9. and C. 11. " And the common Appellation given to Jupiter in " Homer is the Father and King of Gods as well as Men. " And he represents him as Commanding all the " other Gods, ſending them on his Errands, Calling " them to an Account, and ſometimes Chaiſtizing " them. He was call'd *Magnus Deus*, the Great God. " And *Lucian* in his Dialogues brings in *Neptune* " making Suit to *Mercury*, that he might ſpeak with " *Jupiter*. pag. 120. 121. "

L. Sr, not only *Homer*, but all the *Heathen* Poets call *Jupiter* the Father and King of Gods as well as Men, and the *Romans* ſtil'd him *Optimus Maximus*, the beſt and greateſt God. Which makes it plain, that *Jupiter* was the ſupreme God both of the *Greeks* and *Romans*. And ſince, according to what you now labour to prove, the *Heathens* worſhipped the one ſupreme and true God (becauſe this is neceſſary to make good your Parallel) the Conſequence is manifeſt, that the *Jupiter* of the *Heathens* is according to your Doctrin the ſame as the true God of the *Chriſtians*. This *Bishop Stillingfleet* (of whom you have borrow'd your noble Parallel) taught firſt to the Shame and Scandal of *Chriſtianity*. But after *Dr Godwin's* ſolid Confutation of that ſcandalous Piece, I never thought he would have had a Follower. Is it then poſſible that Perſons, who pretend to be Miniſters of the Goſpel, ſhould maintain that the infamous *Jupiter* adored by the *Pagans* was the true God! For if he was the true God then, he is ſo ſtill; and by Conſequence it is no *Blasphemy* to ſay, I believe in *Jupiter the Almighty Creator of Heaven and Earth, and in Jeſus-Chriſt his only Son*. And if any one asks me what *Jupiter* I mean? I may ſafely answer, *Homer's Jupiter: that very Jupiter, whom the Pagans adore*.

This shews how Shocking and Offensive to *Christian Ears* the Consequences are, which follow from your Maintaining that the *Jupiter* of the *Heathens* was the *true Supreme God*.

I am sure at least the *primitive Christians* were not of your Mind. For thousands of them lost their Lives, because they refused to *Worship* the *Jupiter* of the *Heathens*, and they never refused to *Worship* the *true God*. Nay *Orogen* tells us in plain Terms, that he was not the *true God*, but a *Devil*. *We are ready*, says he, *to undergo any Torments rather than confess Jupiter to be God*. For we do not believe *Jupiter* and *Sabbaoth* to be the same, neither indeed to be any God at all, but a *Devil*, who is delighted with the Name of *Jupiter*; an *Enemy to Men and God*. L. 5. contra Celsum. pag. 487 This, Sr, breaks the very Neck of your fine *Parallel*, and so you may go on, if you please.

» G. We have sufficient Testimony in *Scripture*
» of the *Heathens* Acknowledging the one Supreme
» and true God. *Nebucadnezzar* calls him God of Gods,
» and Lord of Kings. Dan. 2. v. 47. pag. 121.

L. But in the very same Verse he calls him *Daniel's God*, which is a sufficient innuendo, that even then he neither Acknowledg'd nor Worshipped him as his own God. I add, that this Profession of the true God was only the Effect of a sudden Transport of Admiration in Regard of *Daniel's* wonderful Discovery and Interpretation of *Nebuchadnezzar's* Dream: But it made no real Change either in his belief or Practice. For the very next Chapter contains a Relation of the famous golden Statue or Idol set up by him with a positive Command, that all should adore it. Nay to shew plainly that he did not believe the *true God*, when *Daniel's* three Companions were brought before him, and accused of refusing to adore

his Statue, he spoke thus insultingly to them, and who is that God, that shall deliver you out of my Hands? Dan. 3. v. 15.

G. But he calls him afterwards *the most high God.* v. 26. "

L. He do's so. But it was like his former Profession, that is, a sudden Transport, when he saw Daniel's three Companions deliver'd by him in a most wonderful Manner out of the fiery Furnace.

G. He says, *I blessed the most High, and I praised and honour'd him, that liveth for ever and ever, whose Dominion is an everlasting Dominion, and his Kingdom from Generation to Generation. And all the Inhabitants of the Earth are reputed as Nothing: And he do's according to his Will in the Army of Heaven, and among the Inhabitants of the Earth, and no Man can stay his Hand, or say unto him, what doest thou?* Dan. 4. v. 34. 35. pag. 121, 122. "

L. This indeed looks like a sincere Profession of the true God. But when was it, that *Nebuchadnezzar* made this Profession? It was after God had humbled him in a strange Manner, and then restored him to his Kingdom according to *Daniel's* Prediction. However it is still a Question disputed, whether this made such a lasting Impression upon him, as to reclaim him entirely from *Idolatry*. The Scripture no where assures us of it. Nor do we find in him the necessary Marks of a sincere Conversion: since he neither released the People of God from their unjust Captivity, nor restored the sacred Vessels, he had carried away in the Pillage of the Temple of *Jerusalem*: as he must have done, if he had been truly converted to God.

G. *Cyrus* also calls him *the Lord God of Heaven.* Ezr. 1. v. 2. And *Darius* the same in as high Expressions, as any Christian could use, *the living God* "

» and stedfast for ever : and his Kingdom that , which
 » shall not be destroy'd , and his Dominion shall be even
 » unto the End , &c. Dan. 6. v. 26. pag. 122.

L. Sr , the *Heathens* , who held the Plurality of Gods , could by Fits and Starts give those Titles to the true one , without Forsaking their false Gods , or Changing their Worship. Therefore as to *Cyrus* , tho he calls him the Lord God of Heaven in the second Verse , he plainly distinguishes him in the third from the God , he Worshipp'd himself. *Who is there* , says he , among you of all his People ? HIS GOD be with him and let him go up to Jerusalem , which is in Judah , and build the House of the LORD GOD OF ISRAEL. He is the God , WHICH IS IN JERUSALEM. *Cyrus* therefore did not regard him as the God of Babilon.

But as to your Quotation from the 6th Chapter of *Daniel* , 'tis the very Chapter I should choose in the whole Bible to prove that the *Heathens* did not Acknowledge or Worship the true God. *Daniel's* miraculous Preservation from the Lions is the principal Subject of it ; and Almighty God , who deliver'd his Servant in so wonderful a Manner , is call'd throughout the whole Chapter the God of Daniel , to distinguish him from the God of the Babilonians. First v. 5. then said these Men , we shall not find any Occasion against this Daniel , except we find it against him concerning the Law of HIS GOD.

2dly , v. 11. Then these Men assembled , and found Daniel Praying , and Making Supplications before HIS GOD.

3dly , it tells us , that when Daniel was cast into the Den of the Lions , the King spake and said unto Daniel , THY GOD , whom thou servest continually , will deliver thee , v. 16. and

4thly , that the King coming early next Morning to the Den cry'd with a lamentable Voice , O Daniel

Servant of the Living God, is *THY GOD*, whom thou serveſt continually, able to deliver thee from the Lions? *ſ. 20.* then ſaid Daniel unto the King, O King live forever, MY GOD has ſent his Angel, &c. *ſ. 21. 22.*

Who ſees not here, that *Daniel's God* is deſign'dly mark'd out as diſtinguiſh'd from the *God of Darius* and the *Babylonians*? Nay in the very *Edict*, wherein the high *Expreſſions* you ſpeak of are found, *Darius* calls him the *God of Daniel*. So that thoſe high *Expreſſions* were indeed the Fruits of a ſudden Tranſport of Joy for *Daniel's* Deliverance, but had no Effect as to any *Change of Worſhip*. And 'tis very remarkable, that by that *Edict Darius* do's not command his Subjects to *Worſhip*, but only to tremble and fear before the *God of Daniel*. *ſ. 26.* So that whiſt that Prince honour'd the true *God* in his *Edict*, both he and the People continued their *Worſhip of Idols* in their *Temples*.

G. My Lord, they did not think it inſiſtent to acknowledge one *God* above all, and yet to ſuppoſe that every Nation had it's own *God* or *Gods* in Subordination to the ſupreme *God*, and as *Deputies* under him. This was their Notion. And they ſuppoſed that *Judea* had it's own tutelary *God*, as well as other Countries. Therefore the King of *Aſſyria* having conquer'd it, ſent to teach his People, who went thither, the Manner of the *God of the Land*, to appeaſe his *Wrath*, who had plagued them with *Lions*. 2. Kings 17. *ſ. 26. 27. 33.* But yet they forſook not their own *Gods*, for it is ſaid, they fear'd the Lord, and ſerved their own *Gods*. And they allow'd the ſame Liberty to the *Jews*, who were not required in any of their Captivities to renounce their own *God*; but only to worſhip the *Gods* of the Nations where they lived. And of theſe tutelary *Gods*, they ſuppoſed one might be ſtronger &

„ or more powerful than another, and therefore they
 „ would boast of their *Gods* one Country against an-
 „ other. Thus said *Senacherib*. *who are they among all*
 „ *the Gods of the Countries, that has deliver'd their*
 „ *Country out of my Hand, that the Lord (the tutelar*
 „ *God of Judea) should deliver Jerusalem out of my*
 „ *Hand? Where are the Gods of Hamath, and of Ar-*
 „ *pad, &c.* 2. Kings c. 18. v. 34. 35. When *Moses*
 „ and *Aaron* told *Pharaoh* that the *God of the He-*
 „ *brews* had met with them, he was not offended
 „ that they had another *God* besides those which
 „ were worshipped in *Egypt*. he took it as a Thing
 „ granted, that every *People* had their own tutelar
 „ *God*.

„ This then was the Difference between the *Jews*
 „ and *Gentiles*; the *Gentiles* thought it lawful to wor-
 „ ship the tutelar *God* of any *Country*, but still in
 „ Subordination to the most high *God*, as has been
 „ shew'd: on the other hand the *Jews* were obliged
 „ to Worship the *Lord God*, the *supreme God*, and
 „ him only, and they were forbid to worship any of
 „ the *Gods* of the *Nations*.

„ But this Sin they often fell into, they Wor-
 „ shipped these *Gods*, but still in Conjunction with
 „ the *Lord* their *God*; and it is said, *they did Wor-*
 „ *ship, and swear by the Lord and swear by Malcham.*
 „ *Zeph.* 1. v. 5. But *Samuel* told them, *if ye return*
 „ *unto the Lord, with all your Hearts, then put away*
 „ *the strange Gods and Ashtaroth from amongst you----*
 „ *and serve him only---* then they did put away *Baalim*
 „ and *Ashtaroth*, and served the *Lord* only. 1. Sam. 7.
 „ v. 3. 4. pag. 122. 123.

L. Sr, what you said first concerning the King of
Assyria sending to teach his People in *Samaria* the
Manner of the God of the Land, is a good Proof that
 the *Assyrians* before they had taken *Samaria* were

utter

utter Strangers to the *Worship* of the *true God*, and in all Probability would have continued so, had it not been for Fear of the Lions. But, to be deliver'd from that Plague, they sent for a Jewish Priest to teach them the *Manner of the God of the Land*: And if *Beelzebub* had been the *God of the Land*, they would have done the same. 'Tis true, after that they modell'd their Religion into a Mixture of *Judaism*, and *Idolatry*, and worshipp'd *God* jointly with their *Idols*, as the *Israelits* following the wicked Example of *Jeroboam* had done before them. But what is all this to the Purpose? Do's it follow hence, that the *Heathens* worshipp'd their *false Gods* with Subordination to the *supreme true God*, as you have most falsly asserted? Or do's it follow, that *Jupiter*, the supreme God of the *Greeks* and *Romans*; or *Baal*, the supreme God of the *Persians*, or *Osyris*, the supreme God of the *Egyptians*, was the same *true God* whom *Christians* adore, which is the scandalous Point you chiefly drive at? Sr, the *Heathen Idolatry* consisted precisely, not in their joining the *Worship* of *false Gods* with that of the *true one*, but in their *Worshipping many false Gods*, one of which they call'd *Supreme*: Yet tho the others were call'd *Inferiour* or *lesser Gods*, they regarded them absolutely as *Gods*, and in many Things wholly *independent*; because they thought they could do either *Good* or *Mischief* by their own *Power*; and therefore they endeavour'd to render them favourable by *Sacrifices*; for they sacrificed as absolutely to their *lesser Gods*, as to their mighty *Jove*. The *Idolatry* of the *Jews* indeed, when they fell into it, was their joining the *Worship* of *false Gods* with that of the *true one*, and therefore they are truly said to have forsaken the Lord; because there is but *one true God*; and he who serves not *him alone*, do's not serve him at all.

» G. It is call'd *Forsaking the Lord*, when we will
 » not obey his Commandements, but worship him
 » otherwise than he has required, and join others
 » with him, which he has forbidden. pag. 124.

L. Yes, Sr, when we join other *Gods* or *Idols* with him. But I hope he has not forbid us to *praise him in his Saints*, or to honour those upon Earth, whom he himself honours in Heaven.

» G. He said, *the House of Israel is estranged from me, separated from me by their Idols: yet come and enquire of a Prophet concerning me. Ezek. 14. v. 5. 7.*
 » and again, *when they had slain their Children to their Idols, then they came the same Day into my Sanctuary.*
 » C. 23. v. 39. And he says to them, *will you burn Incense unto Baal, and walk after other Gods, and come and stand before me in this House, which is call'd by my Name? Jer. 7. v. 4.* It is said, *they fear'd the Lord, and served their own Gods after the Manner of the Nations.* But it immediatly follows, *they fear not the Lord, because they do not after his Statutes, wherein he commanded them not to fear other Gods.*
 » And again, *they fear'd the Lord, and served their graven Images.* 2. Kings C. 17. v. 33. 34. 41. Yet this was Departing from the Fear of the Lord, but not a downright Denial of the *Supreme God*, or Throwing him off from being any more their God, and Taking any other God in his Room as the *Supreme God*. No, but it was Taking other Gods with him, of which he says, *O do not this abominable Thing, which I hate. Jer. 44. v. 4.* pag. 124.

L. Sr, I observe you are always very prodigal of your *Scripture-texts*, when you have a Thing to prove, which is plain and undeniable. For who was ever so ignorant as to deny that the Jews join'd the *Worship of Idols* with that of the *true God*? But what do you infer from it?

G. This was the first Sin, against which God took Care to guard in the first Commandment, thou shalt have none other Gods before me, or with me. Exod. 20. v. 3. 23. And for the Distinction that the Worship of Inferiour Gods, or Ministers of God is not here forbidden, we say, where the Law does not distinguish, we must not. For there is no Law, but may be distinguish'd away. And this is exactly the same Notion the Heathens had of their Demones. And the Worshipping of these or Fearing them, is literally what we call Superstition. It is a Means of Grace, which God has not appointed, pag. 125.

L, What, Sr! Is the Worship of Demons or evil Spirits barely Superstition, and not Idolatry! Or do we make the Worship of Demons a Means of Grace! This is Bidding Defiance to all Shame. But it is not the only impudent Calumny insinuated in this Piece. You tell me first, that joining the Worship of other Gods (Meaning the lesser Gods of the Heathens) with that of the true God is the Sin, against which God took Care to guard us in the first Commandment. And do we deny it? On the Contrary I assure you, Sr, (tho I know you will be sorry to hear it) our Divines teach, that it forbids the Worship of all false Gods whatsoever, that is, not only of those, whom the Heathens call'd inferiour Gods, but also of your Darling great God Jupiter, for whom you are so Religiously concern'd, as not to suffer him to come within the Prohibition of the first Commandment. This indeed is a Scandalous Distinction, which was wholly unknown to the Primitive Christians, who rather chose to lose their Lives than worship Jupiter, as I have already shew'd.

But as to the Distinction, you tacitly father upon us, viz. that the Worship of inferiour Gods is not forbid-

den in the first Commandement. Pray, Sr, in what *Catholic* Author do you find this *Distinction*? Our *Divines* teach indeed with all the *Ancient Fathers* that a *Relative Honour* is due to *God's Saints* and *Angels*; and that this is no more forbid by the first Commandement, than Honouring *God's Servants* upon Earth. But is this the same as Teaching that the *Worship of Demons*, or *Inferiour Gods* is not forbid by that Commandement? The Commandement says, *thou shalt't have none other Gods before me or with me*. But it do's not say, *thou shalt't not honour the Friends and Servants of God*.

You have indeed been very craftily cautious, *first*, to use the Word *Worship*; because it is an *ambiguous Word*, and is promiscuously used to signify either *Divine*, or only an *inferiour* or *Relative Honour*. And *2dly*, by another cunning Slight you make *Inferiour Gods*, and *Ministers of God* to be *Synonymous Terms*. Now I think the *Saints* and *Angels* are truly *Ministers of God*, but not in the Number of the *lesser Gods* of the *Heathens*, that are forbid in the first Commandement. For if they be, your own *Church*, which keeps one Day for all the *Saints in general*, and another for *St Michael* and all *Angels*, is regularly twice a Year guilty of a *Breach* of that Commandement: unless you have the Confidence to say, that *keeping solemn Days in Memory* of the *Saints* and *Angels* is not *Honouring* them in any Manner.

But I presume, Sr, you have now done with your noble *Parallel*, which I think is one of the most notorious Pieces of wilful and *premeditated Slander*, that ever was maintain'd seriously. I shall add a few Remarks to what I have already said, to justify this Censure. It has been your Business to make us appear as *rank Idolaters* as the *Heathens* ever were. And who would have expected any Thing less for Proof

of this enormous *Accusation*, than a full and convincing Evidence at least of one of these three Points; viz. either that *Papists* do not acknowledge and worship the true God, or that they join with it the worship of false Gods, as the Jews did; or that they offer Sacrifice, and pay Divine Honours to the Saints and Angels. For, whoever is justly accused of *Idolatry*, must be proved guilty of one of these three Things.

Now, if you had but attempted to prove any one of these three Articles in plain and express Terms, all the World would have cry'd out Shame upon you, because the *Calumny* would have been too Gross and barefaced. And this you were sensible of. Therefore, to give some plausible colour to your *Parallel*, you have made Use of all the little sinister tricks, that a good stock of *Wit*, but a much greater of *Malice* and *Insincerity* could suggest to you.

First, it being notoriously known, that *Papists* worship the true God, you could not possibly attack them on that Side. Therefore, to lay the Foundation of your *Parallel*, and make them appear no better than *Heathens* even in that *Essential Point*, you have labour'd with all your Strength to prove, that the *Heathens* themselves worshipp'd the same true God, as *Christians* now do. Tho it be a flat Contradiction not only to the general Notion of Mankind, but to innumerable *Texts* of holy *Scripture*.

2dly, because it is an undeniable Truth, that *Papists* do not regard the *Saints* as Gods, but only as the *Servants* of the true God, you had no other Way to bring them upon the Level with *Heathens*, than by Maintaining that all their lesser Gods, were no more in their Opinion than the Powers or Ministers of the true supreme God; tho it be certain, they regarded them all as independent in many Things as to their Power of Doing either Good or Mischief; and 'tis no

toriously known, that they *sacrificed* to their *lesser Gods* as well as to *Jupiter*; and *Sacrifice* is only offerr'd to such as are properly call'd and esteem'd *Gods*.

But least our not Sacrificing to *Saints* and *Angels* should spoil the Beauty of your *Parallel*, you took timely Care to call St *Austin* to your Assistance by a very dexterous and seasonable *Falsification* of his Words. For instead of his Saying, *that they, who proudly require SACRIFICE to be offerr'd to them, and will be WORSHIPPED AS GODS are evil and proud Spirits*, you only make him say, *that they must be evil Spirits, because they required WORSHIP from Men*: and the Reason, which induced you to this Trick of *Legerdemain* is very plain; because the Word *Sacrifice* spoils all, in Determining the *Manner of Worship*, which St *Austin* says is a sure Mark of their being *Evil Spirits*, who requite it; whereas the Word *Worship* being *Equivocal*, St *Austin's* Meaning is left *doubtful*; and the Advantage you make of it is to insinuate, that even the *inferiour Honour* we pay to *Saints* and *Angels*, which may be call'd *Worship*, was condemn'd by that *Father*.

This, Sr, plainly shews, how dear it sometimes costs Men to carry on an unjust Cause. *Truth, Honour, Conscience, Reason, common Sense*, all must be sacrificed to support it. And truly, Sr, I wish you may not have been at the Expence of all these to prove *Papists Idolaters*. This I am sure of, that unless you can either prove, that *Saints* and *Angels* are *evil Spirits*, or that *Desiring their Prayers* is giving them *Divine Worship*, you may as easily prove *White* to be *Black*, as discover the least Shadow of *Idolatry* in our Doctrine of the *Invocation of Saints*.

§. 12.

Of supposititious Saints.

G. MY Lord, in your *Catalogue of Saints* there are many *Supposititious* ones to be found. What think you of the 7 *Sleepers*, who slept 362 Years, and thought it but one Night? pag. 125. "

L. Sr, the 7 *Sleepers* are the 7 Martyrs of *Ephesus*, who when they were put to Death slept in the Lord like St *Stephen*. Act 7. v. 60. That is, died happily; and this is all I believe of their *Sleeping*. The rest has been added by the fabulous *Greeks*, whose Relations we give as little Credit to as you yourselves.

G. What think you of the eleven thousand *English Virgins*, all Martyr'd together at *Cologne*, and the fine Legend told of them? pag. 125. "

L. Sr, I find Nothing of eleven Thousand Virgins in our *Missals*; But that St *Ursula* with her *Companions* suffer'd Martyrdom is no Fable. This I believe, and no more.

G. What do you think of St *George's* killing the *Dragon*, and Rescuing the *King's Daughter*? As true as our Ballad of the *Dragon of Wantley*? pag. 125. "

L. Sr, I join Issue with you, and the two *Dragons* may go together, if you please. But is this a good Argument, St *George* neither kill'd the *Dragon*, nor rescued the *King's Daughter*, therefore there is no such Saint? Nay if fabulous Legends must deprive Saints of their real Being, we shall be in Danger of Losing the *Apostles* as well as some other Saints, who cannot be responsible for Fables told of them any more than the *Apostles*, of whom many fabulous Stories were handed about even in the first Age. One of the Authors

of those Stories, a Priest, was degraded by St John the Evangelist.

» G. My Lord, as ridiculous as these Stories are,
 » yet there are *Days* kept for all these, and *Offices*
 » made for them with Prayers to *them*, and to God,
 » that we may be saved by *these* their *Merits*. pag.
 » 125.

L. What, Sr ! By St George's *Merits* for killing the Dragon ! There is indeed an *Office* of him ; but I don't remember, there is any *Commemoration* in it either of the *Dragon*, or of the *King's Daughter* being rescued by him.

» G. There are Multitudes of the like, which
 » you will find even to a Surfeit in the *Devotions* of
 » the *Roman Church* with their *Breviaries*, *Missals*, *Le-*
 » *gends*, and *Authors* quoted at large. pag. 125. 126.

L. To a Surfeit indeed in that shameful *Libel* ; But the Author's Quotations are many Times full as honest and fair, as your's from St *Austin* upon the 96 Psalm.

» G. And can these Prayers be in *Faith* to Per-
 » sons, that never were in Being ? And for the *Me-*
 » *rit* of Actions, that never were done ? This is a
 » *Means of Grace* of your own Invention indeed ! pag.
 » 126.

L. Sr, a Man must be very incredulous to pretend there never were such Persons in *Being* as the *seven Martyrs of Ephesus*, St *Ursula* with her Companions, and St *George* the ancient *Patron* of *England*, who are the *Saints* you have particularly cull'd out to pass your jests upon : But since they were once in *Being*, I hope they are so still, and we may beg in *Faith*, that is, with a safe Conscience the Blessings of God through their *Intercession*, to which the *Merits* and *Holiness* of their past Lives give doubtless a *Value*. But as to the *Merit of Actions*, that never were done,

done, I have not yet seen a Prayer, for Example, to beg any Favour of God in Consideration of St George's killing the Dragon, or Rescuing the fair Lady out of it's jaws. And therefore your Saying, *this is a Means of Grace of our own Invention*, is such a Piece of insipid Nonsense, that I blush to repeat it.

G. Besides what I have already said, many have been canoniz'd for notorious Crimes, as your St Thomas Becket of Canterbury, whose Merit was, that he would exempt all Ecclesiasticks from the secular Power, tho even in Civil or Criminal Causes, which was call'd Asserting the Liberties of the holy Church, and it is fully asserted in the *Bulla Cœnæ*. But notwithstanding all these Authorities it is a wicked Principle, and dissolves all Civil Government: it exempts from the King's Obedience the first of the three Estates of the Realm; which has or ought to have the greatest Influence upon the People, and transferrs their Allegiance to another Sovereign, which is the highest Treason by the Laws of all well-govern'd Nations as well as by the Laws of God. Yet for Asserting this Becket was canoniz'd; and for not giving Way to it, the King was whipped by the Monks of Canterbury, to which he was forced to submit in those Times of Papal Supremacy.

Such another was the last Year's Saint Pope Pius V. the great assertor, and last Practicer of the Power of the Pope to depose Princes, and who broke the Communion of the Church of England. p. 126.

L. Sr, I have already answer'd your Objection concerning Pope Pius V. (1. Part. §. 53.) against whom I perceive you have a particular Spleen, because he excommunicated your Virgin-Queen, the Foundress, and first Shee-Pope of your Church. But your Saying, that many have been Canoniz'd for Notorious

Crimes is a most *Notorious Calumny*, and more *Becoming the Devil*, who is the profess'd *Enemy of God's Saints*, than a *Christian Divine*.

You instance in *St Thomas of Canterbury*, of whom I have already spoken (1. Part. §. 43.) and justified his standing up for the *Ancient Liberties* of the *Church*, *ibid.* You say *his Merit* was, that he would exempt all *Ecclesiasticks* from the *Secular Power*. - *Sr*, *his Merit* was his constant *Holiness of Life*, his *Pastoral Zeal*, and *invincible Patience* in Suffering the Persecutions of his *Enemies*. *His Merit* was, that he would not betray *his Conscience* to comply with his *Prince*; that he would not leave the *Church*, wherewith God had entrusted him, in a worse *Condition* than he had found it; nor yield up it's *Liberties* to the *Secular Power*, as an unworthy *Successor* of his, your first *Protestant Archbishop Cranmer* did afterwards. This I say, was his merit, which you call a *notorious Crime*; and being assassinated (tho without the *King's Orders*) he had both *God*, and the *King* *Witnesses* of his *Innocence*.

What you add, viz. that the *King* was whipped by the *Monks of Canterbury*, to which he was forced to submit in those *Times of Papal Supremacy*, is false as to his being forced to it. He submitted indeed like another *Theodosius* to the Penance enjoin'd him by the *Pope's Legate*; but his *Whipping* was no Part of it. This he underwent voluntarily three Years after, when he made a *Pilgrimage* to *St Thomas's Tomb* to beg his *Prayers* against the *French*, the *Scots*, and his own rebellious *Son*. And God was pleased to manifest in a singular Manner how acceptable this *Humiliation* was to him. For upon the very Day that he layd prostrate at *St Thomas's Tomb*, the *King of Scots* was taken Prisoner. Soon after he rais'd the Siege of *Rouën*, which his *Son* and the *French King* attack'd and in a short Time found himself quiet Possessor of his

§. 13. *Of Devotion to the blessed Virgin.* 75
Kingdom. All these Particulars you will find in the
learned *Du Pin*. Cent. 12. p. 132. of whose Veracity I
know you have a great Opinion.

§. 13.

Of Devotion to the blessed Virgin.

G. **T**Here is one Saint truly so, of whom I
have reserved to speak in this Place, be-
cause of the Excesses in your Church in their De-
votions to her bordering even upon *Blasphemy* to
any common Ear. pag. 127. "

L. Now indeed you startle me. I hope however
we do not make a *Goddeß* of her, nor offer *Sacrifice*
to her: tho we endeavour to pay her all the Honour
due to her as *Mother of God*.

G. No less than a canoniz'd Person, St *Bona-*
venture has publish'd what he calls the *Psalter* of
the *blessed Virgin Mary*, wherein every one of the
150 Psalms as likewise the *te Deum*, and other most
solemn Adorations of God are all turn'd to the *Vir-*
gin Mary. pag. 127. "

L. Sr, I answer *first*, that the *Psalter* attributed
to St *Bonaventure* is not his. For neither *Trithemius*
nor *Gesnerus* place it amongst his Works. Nor is it
probable a Man of St *Bonaventure's* Judgment and
Learning should be the Author of such an indiscreet
Piece. I answer 2^{ly}, that it is in the Catalogue of
forbidden Books, and is therefore far from being
a Part of the Devotions of the *Church of Rome*. So
pray go on.

G. *Rosaries*, and Books of Devotions to her are
many ---- "

L. That's very true, Sr.

G. Here is one translated into *English* for the "

» Use of the *Roman Catholicks* here, intitl'd, *the De-*
 » *votion of Bondage, or the Practice of perfectly Conse-*
 » *crating ourselves to the Service of the Blessed Virgin,*
 » *permissu Superiorum* 1632. it is licens'd, and highly
 » recommended both to Clergy and People by the
 » *Bishop of St Omers* with several Indulgences gran-
 » ted to those, who shall devoutly make Use of it.
 » Wherein we offer up ourselves both Souls and
 » Bodies as *Bondslaves* to the *blessed Virgin*. Among
 » the high Prerogatives of the *blessed Virgin* you will
 » find this the sixth pag. 32. *the sovereign Dominion*
 » *that was given her not only over the World, but over*
 » *the Creator of the World*. This indeed might well
 » ground this Petition made to her, *jure Matris im-*
 » *pera filio*, that is, *by the Right of a Mother command*
 » *your Son*. And her being call'd the *Mother of the whole*
 » *Trinity* in the *Missal. Polon. fol. 237. pag. 127.*

L. Sr, it is the first Time I ever heard of *Missal.*
Polon. But this I am sure of, that whoever stiles the
Virgin Mary the *Mother of the whole Trinity*, and
 means what he says, is a rank *Heretick*; and if he
 should teach this Doctrine at *Rome*, he would either
 have a Mad-house, or the Prison of the Inquisition
 assign'd him for his Lodging.

As to the Book entitl'd *the Devotion of Bondage,*
&c. Whatever Approbation it had at it's first co-
 ming Forth, it has been condemn'd many Years ago.
 And so it is impertinent to reproach us with it. I
 heartily wish your Church took the same Care to
 condemn and suppress all the *scandalous, prophane,*
and Atheistical Books, that are publickly printed in
London, and suffer'd to be in the Hands of every
 Body.

But as to those Words, *by the Right of a Mother*
command your Son, tho I allow the Expression to be
 too hyperbolical, they are capable of a fair and Or-

thodox Construction, if they meet with an unprejudiced Reader. For there are even in Scripture some Expressions, which carry with them the same Vehemence, and in Appearance the same hyperbolical Excess. As, when it is said, that *Josue spoke to our Lord, and the Sun stood still*, God OBEYING the Voice of a Man. Jos. 10. v. 12. 14. and when our Saviour says of himself, that *in Heaven he will make his Servants sit down at Meat, and will SERVE them*. Luke 12. v. 37. For, as the former of these Expressions do's not signify a real Obedience in God to the Voice of a Man, but his Readiness to hear the Prayers of those that fear him, nor the latter that Christ will really serve the Elect at Table, but only expresses his tenderness for them, and the Care he will take to complete their joy and Happiness; so these Words, *by the Right of a Mother command your Son*, do not signify that she should really command him, as she did when he was subject to her upon Earth, but that she will use that Interest with him in our Behalf, which as a Mother she has with him above all other Saints.

G. My Lord, in the *Primer*, or Office of the *« blessed Virgin* printed in *English* 1699. (and in the *« Exposition* before it's said to be of great Antiquity, and composed by the Church directed by the *« Holy Ghost*) you will find many Prayers to her *« not only of Intercession or Praying for us, but to *« grant Grace, Pardon of Sins, and eternal Life* in as *« full and positive Terms, as could be ask'd of God *« himself. See the Hymn, memento rerum Conditor. *« pag. 34. and Ave Maris stella, pag. 53. And the *« Prayer to her, pag. 59. under thy Aid --- sub tuum *« presidium, which is taken out of the Roman Ponti- *« fical in the Office for the Consecrating an Image *« of the B. Virgin, where you pray for Aid directly *«*********

» without Mentioning any *Intercession*. pag. 127. 128.

L. Sr, the *Primer* is certainly a Prayer-book of great Authority amongst us, and I stand to every Thing you can find in it. *First*, you dislike the Hymn, *memento rerum Conditor*. I presume chiefly because it stiles the *B. Virgin* the *Mother of Grace*. And is not she the *Mother of Grace*, who brought forth Christ the Fountain of all Grace? 2ly, you carp at the *ave Maris stella*, and the Anthem, *sub tuum Præsidium*. But Sr, one Verse of the *Ave Maris stella* is this, *bona cuncta posce*, ask all good Things for us, which fully explains the meaning of all the rest. And the Anthem, *sub tuum Præsidium* is generally concluded with this Versicle, *ora pro nobis*, pray for us. But suppose the Word *pray* or *intercede* be not always express'd, may not the Church be allow'd to use her own way of Speaking as well as other Societies of Men, especially when her Meaning is as well known as the Alphabet?

G. Pray, My Lord, whence must the People take the Sense of their Prayers, but from the Signification of the Words?

L. But must the Signification of those Words be always interpreted by the Rules of *Grammer*? I think our *Councils* and *Catechisms* are better Interpreters of the Sense of our publick Prayers, than *William Lilly* or *Littleton's Dictionary*. When the Scripture speaks thus; *I say, ye are Gods*. Psal. 81. or tells us, *that God obey'd the Voice of a Man*, a Grammarian will perhaps cry out *Blasphemy*! But a *Divine* will give him a civil Reprimand, and tell him he must consult *Divines* and not *Pedants* for the true Meaning of *Scriptural Phrases*. And so it is with the Language of the Church in her Prayers. She is the sole Interpreter of their true Sense, and she has sufficiently declared, that in what Form soever her Prayers to Saints are express'd,

she means no more than to implore their *Intercession* to the *Giver of all good Gifts*. So that when we desire the *blessed Virgin* to *help*, *comfort*, or *deliver us* from *Sin*, or bring us to *eternal Life*, the true Meaning is (and she knows it to be so) that we only desire her to obtain for us those Blessings of God through the *Mediation of Jesus-Christ*.

§. 14.

The Blessed Virgin not put upon the Level with Christ.

G. MY Lord, your *Church* blesses in the Name of the *Virgin Mary*, which was never done to any Creature. The *Priesthood* was ordain'd by God to *bleß in his Name*. No *Apostle* or *Angel* ever *blessed the People in his own Name*. Deut. 10. 8. But in this *Primer*, pag. 16. you will see the *Priest* give the *Blessing* in these Words. *The Virgin Mary with her pious Son bleß us*, to which the *People* answer, *Amen*. Here the principle Part is given to the *Virgin*. Her *Son* only blesses with her, and she is first named. But if she be not *preferr'd*, yet she is here put upon the Level at least with her *Son*, and *blesses the People* jointly with him. pag. 128.

L. Sr, I should not be surpriz'd to hear a *Gram-marian* argue as you do. But I take it to be beneath a *Divine* to lay a Stress upon a meer *grammatical* Construction in a *theological* Dispute. When a Child, for Example, says, *bleß me Father*; here not only the principal Part of *Blessing* is literally and *grammatically* given to the *Father*, but God is not so much as mention'd, and the *Father* alone is named. And will you be so weak, as to conclude from thence, that the Child's *Father* is *preferr'd* to, or put upon

the *Level* with God? If you be, Children themselves will tell you, that when they say, *Father bleß me*, they mean no more than to desire their Father to pray to God to bleß them; and so when we desire the *Virgin Mary* to bleß us with her Son, we only beg of her to obtain for us a *Blessing* of God through the *Mediation* of *Jesus-Christ*.

ADVERTISEMENT.

The Gentleman after his last Words labours hard to prove, that the Angel, whom Jacob pray'd to bleß his Sons, was not an Angel, but Christ: who (as he tells us) often appear'd before he took Flesh. I fancy indeed he will find but few of his Opinion. But it being a Point of no Consequence is omitted, and the Gentleman go's on thus.

„ G. **E**piphanus Har. 78. 79. reckons the *Worship*
 „ of the *Virgin Mary* (not then so rank) a-
 „ mong the *Heresies* under the Name of the *Collyri-*
 „ *dians*, who offer'd *Cakes* to the *Moon* as the *Queen*
 „ of *Heaven*, which is the same Name you now give
 „ to the *Virgin*, and she is painted standing upon the
 „ *Moon* her *Representative*. pag. 129.

L. What will not Prejudice prompt a Man to say! The *Collyridians* offer'd *Cakes* and *Flower* in *Sacrifice* to the *Queen of Heaven*. that is, *Worshipped* her as a *Goddeß*; and yet their *Worship* was not so rank as ours. And why so? Because we stile the *Virgin Mary Queen of Heaven*, and she is painted standing upon the *Moon*. Who will not be convinced by such strong Reasons?

„ G. *Epiphanius* observes, that our blessed Lord
 „ foreseeing the *Superstition*, that would come into the
 „ **World**

World on Account of his *Mother* ; treated her “ always at a Distance ; never once call’d her *Mo-* “ *ther*, no not upon the *Cross*, or by any other Ap- “ pellation, than that of *Woman*, and checking her “ *Forwardness* said unto her, *Woman*, what have I to “ do with thee. John. 2. v. 4. She is as little named “ as possible in the *Gospels*, where *Christ* pronounces “ a greater Blessing to those that hear his *Word*, “ than to the *Womb* that bare him. Luke 11. v. 28. “ And she is not reckon’d among those, who saw “ him after his *Resurrection*. She is but once named “ in the *Acts of the Apostles*, and that upon no other “ Account, than that she with other *Women* con- “ tinued in the Communion of the *Apostles* after the “ *Ascension* of our *Lord*, Act. 1. v. 14. But none of “ her *Acts* or *Miracles* are recorded, tho Abundance “ in the *Legends*. And she is not once named upon “ any Account whatsoever in any of the *Epistles*. “ Strange ! that this should be so forgot, which “ makes now so great a Part in the *Devotions* of the “ *Church of Rome*. pag. 129. 130. “

L. Strange! do you say *Sr?* And is it not much more *Strange*, that a *Christian Divine* should employ the very best of his *Rhetorick* to lessen, and depreciate the *Blessed Mother of Christ* ! For were I an utter Stranger to the *Principles of Christian Religion*, and should hear a *Christian* set forth the *Blessed Virgin* as you have done, I should form no other *Idea* of her, than that she was some *despicable Creature*, whom *Christ* was ashamed to own for his *Mother* ; whose *Forwardness*, as you call it, he was forced to check : whom he utterly neglected at his *Death*, and for whom neither the *Apostles* nor *Evangelists* had the least *Regard*. This, *Sr*, is the *Idea*, which your *Discourse* would form in any Man not guarded beforehand by the *Principles of Christian Religion*.

'Tis true, the *Evangelists* mention no *tender Expressions* of our *Saviour* to his *blessed Mother*: neither do they mention any *tender Expressions* of her's to her *Son*, nor even that she felt any *Grief* at his *Death*. But I hope we must not conclude from thence, either that she had a *Heart of Stone*, or that these *Omissions* were intended by the *Holy Ghost* to prevent our being too tenderly affected towards our *Saviour's Passion*: which suffices to shew the *Weakness* of your chief Remark.

However, Sr, the *Scripture* is not so very *Silent* concerning the *Blessed Virgin*, as you represent it; unless the very first Chapter of *St Luke* be no Part of *Scripture*. For in that Chapter you will find the *whole Foundation*, on which our *Devotion* to the *Blessed Virgin* is built. What do you think of the *Angels Salutation*, *Hail, full of Grace, our Lord is with thee?* *Luke* 1. v. 28. which contains the sublimest Panygerick, that ever was made of a *pure Creature*. What do you think of the *Words* of *Elizabeth*, who was fill'd with the *Holy Ghost*, and she spoke with a loud *Voice*, and said, *Blessed art thou amongst Women, and blessed is the Fruit of thy Womb.* *Luke* 1. v. 41. 42. she spoke with a loud *Voice*, and was not afraid to be censured for Naming the *Mother* before the *Son*, which is one of your weighty *Objections* against the *Church of Rome*. Lastly, what do you think of the *Blessed Virgin's* own *Prophetick Words*, for behold from henceforth all *Generations* shall call me *blessed.* *Luke* 1. v. 48. which may be call'd a plain *Prediction* of the *Honour* and *Respect*, which the *Church* has paid her throughout all *Ages*. *Strange!* That our *Blessed Lord* should foresee the *Superstition* (as you call it) which would come into the *World* on Account of his *Mother*, and yet inspire his *Evangelists* to write things of her, which give us the highest *Idea* of her *Dignity*.

§. 14. put upon the Level, &c. 83
and *Merits*, and are the whole Ground of that *Devotion*, which you pretend *Christ* intended to prevent.

G. But, My Lord, you take no Notice, that the Observations I have made relating to the *Virgin Mary*, and which you have reflected upon with so much Tartness, are not my own, but taken from *Saint Epiphanius*. Hær. 79.

L. Sr, you wrong *St Epiphanius*, not only in Misrepresenting the Drift of his Discourse, but also by Adding to his Words, and Mixing your own *undecent Reflections* with his in such a Manner, as to make them appear to be his. For pray, Sr, tell me where will you find any of these Reflections relating to the *Blessed Virgin* in *Saint Epiphanius*? viz. that *Christ* call'd her *Woman* TO CHECK HER FORWARDNESS? That she is as little named as is possible in the Gospels? That our Saviour always treated her at a Distance. That they, who hear the Word of God have greater Blessings pronounced to them than the Mother of *Christ*? That she is not reckon'd amongst those, who saw him after his Resurrection, and that she is but once named in the Acts of the Apostles, and not once in the Epistles?

These, Sr, are all your own Observations, and they shew the profound Respect you have for the Mother of *Christ*; but not one of them is to be found in *St Epiphanius*, whose Words faithfully render'd are these. Wherefore we are also precaution'd by the holy Gospel, wherein *Christ* speaks thus, *Woman*, what is it to me and to thee? My Hour is not yet come. *John* i. 4. Where for this Reason he call'd her *Woman*, least any one should believe the *Blessed Virgin* to be of some more Excellent Nature [viz. than the rest of *Womankind*.] Giving her, as it were, prophetically that Name to refute the Heresies, and Schisms, which he knew would in Aftertimes happen in the World: And least any one through an excessive Opinion of the most holy *Virgin* should be ad-

dicted to the Dotage and Fooleries of that Heresy. L. 3. T. 4. Hæc. 79.

Now, Sr, the *Heresy*, St Epiphanius treats of in the Place quoted, is that of certain bigotted Women of Thrace call'd Collyridians, who not only assumed to themselves the Priestly Office, but made a Goddess of the Blessed Virgin, and Worshipped her with Sacrifice: Which Madness or Dotage he refutes at large, and then observes, that to prevent our Falling into this Dotage, viz. of Believing the Blessed Virgin to be more than a WOMAN, and Worshipping her as a GODDESS, Christ took Care to call her Woman, saying at the Wedding in Cana of Galilee, *quid mihi & tibi Mulier: nondum venit hora mea*; Woman, what is it to me and to thee? My Hour is not yet come. And is this the same as your unhandsome Reflection, viz. that Christ foreseeing the Superstition, which would come into the World [by which you mean what St Epiphanius never thought of] always treated her AT A DISTANCE, and CHECKING HER FORWARDNESS said unto her, Woman what have I to do with thee?

But, Sr, our Blessed Saviour did not always treat his Mother at a Distance, as you pretend. For St Luke tells us expressly, that he went down with his Father and Mother to Nazareth, and was subject unto them, Luke 2. v. 51. That is to say, obey'd them, as dutiful Children do their Parents; which with your Leave, Sr, is not Treating them at a Distance. Nay at that very Time, when instead of Giving to the Blessed Virgin the tender Name of Mother he call'd her Woman, he had a Regard to her Request, and upon her Intercession manifested himself by the first Miracle, he ever wrought. Which I think was Encouraging his future Church to have a Confidence in her Prayers.

„ G. But there is an Honour of an extraordinary Nature paid to her at the Head of all the Saints in

§. 14. *put upon the Level, &c.* 85
 the Office of the *Maß*; where, before the Consecration, the Elements are offer'd up to God in Memory of the *Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension* of *Jesus-Christ*, and for the *Honour* of the Blessed *Virgin Mary, &c. in honorem beatae Mariae semper Virginis*. Did Christ then suffer, rise, and ascend for her *Honour*? It was for the Honor and Glory of God indeed, but to thrust her in, or any of the *Saints* to share in this, looks a little too familiar, and putting them, at least *her*, near upon the Level with the *Almighty*, since more could not be said to him. pag. 130. 131. "

L. No, Sr! That's very strange. For I can say to God, thou art my *Creator, my Redeemer, my Sanctifier, my sovereign Good and last End*. I can say to God, thou art infinitely powerful, infinitely good, and infinitely Wise, &c. finally, I can say to God, *I offer to thee this holy Sacrifice*, and I cannot say any one of these Things to the *Blessed Virgin* without *Blasphemy*. I therefore hope she is not put so near, as you will needs have it, upon the Level with the *Almighty*.

Now, as to your Argument, which is contain'd in this smart Question, *did Christ then suffer, rise, and ascend for her Honour*? You will as easily make a Rope of Sand, as shew any Connection between the Consequence implied in your Question, and the Premises. What admirable Logick is this! *The Elements are offer'd in Memory of the Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of Christ, and in Honour of the Blessed Virgin Mary: therefore Christ suffer'd, and ascended for her Honour*.

G. But what do you then mean by your *in honorem beatae Mariae semper Virginis, &c. in Honour of the Virgin Mary*?

L. That, Sr, is a fair Question. For as we best know, so 'tis but just we should be allow'd to ex-

plain our own Meaning, which is precisely this; we offer up the *Sacrifice* to God in Remembrance of the *Death, Resurrection, and Ascension* of Christ, and in *Thanksgiving* for the great Gifts and Graces he has bestow'd upon his *Blessed Mother*, and other *Saints*.

G. But how can this be call'd Offering the *Sacrifice* in Honour of the *Blessed Virgin*, &c.

L. Very properly, Sr; because the *Saints* are honour'd by our Celebrating their *Memories* in the solemn *Sacrifice* of the *Mass*, and Offering up our publick *Thanksgiving* to God for the *Victories* they have obtain'd through his Grace. And this is just what St *Austin* teaches (*Ench. C. 110.*) When the *Sacrifice* (says he) is offer'd in the Church for the faithful departed, it is to such as were Good, but not perfectly good, a *Sacrifice of Propitiation*. But to the perfectly good, of *Thanksgiving*. Now, Sr, you may proceed, if you please.

G. My Lord, you interrupted me. I told you just now, that Offering the *Sacrifice* in Honour of the *Virgin Mary* and other *Saints*, was putting them near upon the Level with the Almighty.

L. You did so.

» G. And here we may see a good Reason, why
» God would not have any *Religious Worship* paid to
» these, or any *Ministers* of his Kingdom, nor would
» be worshipped with them. For he saw there would
» be *Encroaching*, and *Coming nearer* to him, than
» was fit for the Condition of *Creatures*. They would
» have a Share with him. Nay that they might come
» at last to advance these above God himself, and
» prefer the *Saints* even to Christ. pag. 131.

L. Sr, this whole Piece comes a *Begging*; For it confidently supposes the two very Points, you ought to prove. First, that God has forbid all *Religious Worship*, that is, all Honour to be paid to his *Ministers*; Nay 'tis a Contradiction to your own Practice in

§. 14. *put upon the Level, &c.* keeping one *holy Day* for all *Saints*, and another for *St Michael* and all the *Angels*. 2dly, it supposes that we put *Creatures* near upon the *Level* with the *Almighty*, which I have disproved at large: But you are not disposed to take Notice of any Thing I say to you.

G. My Lord, you were too quick for me. But I shall now prove, that you advance the *Saints* above *God* himself, and prefer them even to *Christ*. As it *“* has been said, *that Christ did nothing, which St Fran- “* *cis did not do: yea that he did more than Christ himself. “* *Lib. Conform. fol. 1149. “*

L. Sr, I must own you have a peculiar Talent at *Raking Kennels* for *Dirt* and *Filth* to throw at us. 'Tis a Providence however, that the *Words*, you have pick'd up, are not to be found either in any *Council*, or *Catechism*, or *Papal Constitution*, or *Pope Pius's Profession of Faith*, where you ought to seek for our Doctrine; but only in *Lib. Conform.* a Book I never heard of before. But whoever is the Author of it, I presume he do's not Mean that *St Francis* (tho a most *holy* and *eminent Saint*) either *created the World*, or *redeem'd Mankind*, or ever wrought any *Miracle* by his own *Power*. So that we may, (I hope) acquit him of *Blasphemy*, tho not of *Indiscretion*. And all you can conclude from it is, that there are some *indiscreet Writers* in all Churches whatsoever. But is a Church accountable for all the indiscreet Expressions of particular *Writers*? I think not.

§. 15.

The Index Expurgatorius examined.

G. **N**OW, My Lord, we see the Reason, why *“* your *Index Expurgatorius* would not have *“* it seen in the *Fathers* that *God alone is to be worship. “*

» *ped.* For they have expunged this out of the *Indices*
 » of their *Works*, that it might not be found
 » by the People, who might take Offence to see
 » their *Worship* divided betwixt *God* and *Creatures*.
 » [*adorari solius Dei est : deleatur ex Ind. operum A-*
 » *thanasii.* *Indice Lib. prohib. & Expurg.* pag. 52.
 » *Madrit.* Ann. 1627. item ex *Ind. Op. S. Aug.* *ibid.*
 » pag. 56.]

» Was there ever so shameless a Thing done by
 » any *Church* as to take upon them to correct and al-
 » ter the *Fathers*? It is plainly to stifle the Evidence
 » against themselves, and render every Thing at
 » least *suspected*, that they quote out of them. And
 » the *Scriptures* had been *purged* too, but that they
 » are so common in the Hands of *Protestants*, that
 » it could not be done without manifest *Detection*.
 » but how far they have gone towards it by *Mistrans-*
 » *lations*, *Adding* or *Leaving out* some *Words* I have
 » shew'd already. But to pursue the Subject we are
 » now upon ---- pag. 131. 132.

L. Hold, Sr, let me answer this Piece first; and
 I will do it with all the Temper and Moderation pos-
 sible; tho the Foulness of the *Misrepresentation*, it con-
 tains, might justify the warmest Language. You flat-
 ly charge us with *Correcting* and *Altering* the *Fathers*
in Order to stifle, as you say, *their Evidence against*
us; yet in the same Breath you contradict yourself
 by *Confessing*, that the *Alteration* you speak of, was
 made only in the *Indices* of their *Works*. For can
 any Man be so stupid as to make no Difference be-
 tween the *Works themselves* of the *Fathers*, and the
Indices, that have been since made to 'em by other
 Hands?

You add, that the *Scriptures* had been *purged* too,
 but that they are so common in the Hands of *Protestants*,
 that it could not be done without manifest *Detection*.

Which

Which Reflection is as void of *Common Sense* as *Justice*. For are not the *Fathers* as *Common* in the Hands of all *learned Protestants* as *Scriptures*? And how then could we corrupt the *Fathers* with greater *Security* than the *Scriptures*?

But, Sr, you forget the *many hundred Years* before the *Reformation*, wherein *Popery* was in Possession of *whole Christendom*, as your *Book of Homilies* testifies, and all *Protestants* are forced to own. And had we not then all the Opportunity imaginable to alter both *Scriptures* and *Fathers*, if we had been wicked enough to do it? For where were then the *Protestants* to controll us, or convict us of *Forgery*? Pray, Sr, let me advise you to think of some better Reason, than our *Fear of being detected by Protestants*, that hinder'd us from *Altering the Scriptures*? For tho this may pass current with *Idiots*, yet Men of Understanding will not be imposed upon in so gross a Manner.

You say our *Correcting and Altering the Fathers renders every Thing, we quote out of them, suspected*. But, good Sr, are our Quotations from the *Fathers* taken out of their *Indexes*? Are they not transcribed from their own *Writings*? How is it possible a Man of Sense should commit such a Blunder! Truly nothing but an overeager Desire of Asperging us could render you capable of it.

Now let us examine the *bloody Fact*, which you set off with this pathetick Exclamation. *Was there ever so shameless a Thing done by any Church as to take upon them to correct and alter the Fathers!* Without Dispute, Sr, *Falsifying the Fathers* is a most shameful Thing: For otherwise I have been too hard upon you in Censuring you so sharply for it. But I do not think it at all shameful to correct an *Index*, which misrepresents the *true Sense* of the *Father's* words, it referr's to: And this is truly the *Fact*, you inveigh so bitterly against.

One *Wolfgangus Musculus* a German Protestant puts forth an Edition of some Works of the Fathers, and makes an *Index* to them: And to insinuate to the Reader that it is their Doctrine, that no Honour is to be paid to Saints, he puts down in the *Index* this equivocal Expression, *adorari Solius Dei est*; God alone is to be adored, or Worshipped. Which in the Sense of the Fathers, it refers to, is certainly true; but false in the intended Meaning of the Publisher. This therefore the *Index Expurgatorius* orders to be blotted out; because it insinuates a Sense, which never was taught by any of the Fathers; who certainly mean nothing else, than that God alone is to be Worshipped with Divine Honour.

I shall instance in a Parallel Case to set the Matter in a clear Light. Suppose a Socinian should put forth an Edition of the *New Testament*, and in his *Index* to it should put these Words, *the Son is not equal to the Father*, Referring the Reader to these Words of Christ, *My Father is greater than I*. John 14. v. 28. I ask, whether your Church would not think it very Just to correct and alter that *Index*? Tho the Socinians should clamour against it, and cry out, *was there ever so shameless a Thing done by any Church, as to take upon them to correct, and alter the Scriptures!* But I really believe you would in that Case be clear-sighted enough to discern a Difference between *Altering the Scripture itself*, and *Correcting a scandalous Index* made to it. And if you are not blinded with Passion, you will also be clear-sighted enough to see, that this is a full Answer to your unjust Clamours against the *Index Expurgatorius*, and the Calumny your Conscience is charged with in Representing us as Falsifiers of the Fathers. But you were Going to say something else, which you may now do, if you please.

§. 16.

Of Reliques.

G. **M**Y Lord, not only the *Souls* of the *Saints* in Heaven, but their *Dead Bodies*, or *Bits* of them; a *Finger*, a *Toe*, or a *Tooth*, or a *Scrap* of their *Cloaths*, a *Girdle*, or a *Book*, or any Thing else, that they used, are *Worshipped*, and made *Means of Grace*, and great *Miracles* are said to be done by them. pag. 132. "

L. *Are Said*, Sir, do you say? And dare you deny it? If you do, the *Devils* themselves, who have confess'd it, will blush for you. *Vigilantius* condemn'd by all Antiquity for an *Heresiarch*, was the *Devil's* great *Champion* against the *Veneration* of *Reliques*, which was the *Church's* universal Practice even in her purest Times. But let us hear how St *Jerom* complemented him upon it. *Vigilantius*, says he, fights with an unclean Spirit against the Spirit of Christ by Asserting that the *Tombs* of *Martyrs* are not to be revered. Lib. contra Vigil. And again, ibid. The *Devils*, with which *Vigilantius* is possess'd, roar at the *Reliques*, and confess they cannot bear the Presence of the *Martyrs*. Nay in the same Book he tells him, that all the *Bishops* in the *World* are against him. *Ergo totius Orbis errant Episcopi?* &c. And in his 53. Epistle he writes thus. You tell me, that *Vigilantius* vomits once more his Poison against the *Reliques* of *Martyrs*, calling us *DUST-WORSHIPPERS*, AND *IDOLATERS* FOR *REVERENCING DEAD MEN'S BONES*. Oh unhappy Man, who can never be sufficiently lamented!

Here, Sir, you see yourself described in the Person of *Vigilantius* by an eminent Saint and Doctor of God's Church: which should, me thinks, suffice to

open your Eyes, and make you see the Badness of the Cause, in which you are engaged. If you had lived in the 4th Century, and profess'd yourself a Disciple of *Vigilantius*, as you now do, St *Jerom* would have treated you, as he did that infamous *Heretick*. He would have told you, that you fought with an unclean Spirit against the Spirit of Christ. That, you were possessed by that evil Spirit. That all the Bishops in the World were against you. That finally you were in a most unhappy and lamentable State.

But you think it a mighty Jest, that we reverence (or, as you call it, *Worship*) not only the Bodies of Saints, but a Finger, a Toe, or a Tooth, or a Scrap of their Cloaths. But pray, Sr, where lies the jest? May not the Finger, the Toe, or Tooth of a Saint, or a Scrap of his Cloaths work Miracles as well as the Shadow of St *Peter*? Act. 5. v. 15. Or the Aprons and Handkerchiefs, that but touch'd St *Paul's* Body, yet cured Diseases, and chased away evil Spirits? Act. 19. v. 12. Or must it needs be an entire Body to make it a proper Instrument for God to work Miracles with? If this be the Ground of your jest, *Theodoret*, who wrote in the 4th Age, will disabuse you. Cities, and Villages, says he, Dividing among themselves the Bodies of the Martyrs esteem them their Guardians, and the Protectors and Physicians both of their Souls and Bodies --- For tho the Body be divided, the Blessing is not: but is bountifully distributed according to the Faith, with which it is approach'd. L. 8. cont. Græcos. T. 4. p. 593. 594.

Nay the very Ashes of the Martyrs were held in the same Veneration as their Bodies; as appears from *Vigilantius* his Calling the Catholics DUST-WORSHIPPERS, and is witness'd by St *Isidore* of *Pelusium* writing thus to a Pagan. If this offend you, that we honour the Ashes of Martyrs, because they loved God, and served him constantly, ask them, who have been heal'd by

them, and enquire into the Number of Distempers, from which they have been free'd? If you do this, you will be so far from Laughing at what we do, that you will be willing to join with us in so good a Practice. L. 1. Ep. 55. Pray, Sr, follow the Advice of this good Saint, and leave off joining with Hereticks and Pagans in Ridiculing Practices, which venerable Antiquity has so solemnly recommended to us.

I shall only add St Ambrose's Words after his Discovery of the Reliques of St Gervasius and Protasius, which alone suffice to confute any Thing, you can say upon this Subject. You have known (says he) nay you have seen many dispossess'd, many cured, as soon as they touch'd the Shroud of the holy Bodies, from their Infirmities. The ancient Miracles of Christ are renew'd. You see many cured by the Shadow, as it were, of their Bodies. How many Handkerchiefs are they touch'd with? How many Veils by Touching the sacred Reliques become Instruments of the greatest Cures? Every one is glad to touch the most distant Hem, and if he do's it, he will be heal'd. Ep. 22. Now, Sr, you may laugh on if you please. But even your Protestant Translators of Mr Du Pin Cent. 8. p. 120. confess, that it pleased God for the Testimony of his Doctrine and Truth to work great Miracles by the Dead Bodies of his Saints in Witness, that they had been his Messengers, and Instruments of his Will.

G. My Lord, God may work Miracles by what Means he pleases. pag. 132. "

L. Now, Sr, you are very good indeed. For you grant me all I desire.

G. But do's this consecrate the Dead Body of every Saint to be a Means of Grace, and a Worker of Miracles? pag. 132. "

L. Sr, that is your ridiculous Consequence, and not mine. All I say is, that when God Works Mi-

racles by the *Body* of any *Saint*, he certainly do's work *Miracles* by it.

» G. Many *Miracles* were wrought by the *Rod* of
 » *Moses*, is every *Rod* therefore a *Means* of *Grace* ei-
 » ther *Ghostly* or *Bodily*? Or may we consecrate any
 » *Rod* to be such a *Means*? pag. 132.

L. No, Sr. But if God pleases, he may work
Miracles by any *Rod*. And so he may work *Miracles*
 by the *Body* of any *Saint*; and if he do's work *Mira-*
cles by it, we may surely believe, that he do's work
Miracles by it.

» G. Nothing is such a *Means* to us, but what
 » God has commanded and appointed to be done, as
 » *Baptism*, and the *Lord's Supper*. pag. 132.

L. What, Sr! Did God command and appoint *A-*
prons and *Handkerchiefs*, which wrought *Miracles*,
Act. 19. v. 12. to be such *Means* of *Grace* as *Baptism*,
 and the *Lord's Supper*?

» G. It is the *Institution* and not the *Example*, that
 » makes any Thing a *Means* of *Grace* to us. Else we
 » might go and imitate all the *Miraculous* Actions of
 » *Moses*, or of *Christ*, and call them *Means* of *Grace*
 » to us, because so used by them. pag. 132. 133.

L. Sr, it is the *Institution*, and nothing but the
Institution of *Christ* that makes such *Means* of *Grace* as
Baptism, and the *Lord's Supper*. If therefore you
 speak of *Means* of *Grace* strictly taken, the *Sacra-*
ments alone are such *Means*, as I have already fre-
 quently inculcated. But you are either very thick
 of Hearing, or have a short Memory. For you take
 no Notice of any Thing I say, but go on Repeating
 the same Gross Mistakes twenty Times over as con-
 fidently, as if they were first Principles, or Truths al-
 low'd of by me.

I tell you therefore once for all that the *Sacra-*
ments alone are *Means* of *Grace* strictly taken; which

never fail of Producing their Effect, but when some wilful Obstacle is put to it. But in a *large Sense* any Thing may be call'd a *Means of Grace*, which God is pleas'd to make Use of at any Time as an *Instrument* to convey his *Blessings* to us, tho it be not ordain'd by any *Express Institution* in Order to that End.

Now if you speak of *Means of Grace strictly taken*, what you say, viz. *that nothing is such a Means to us, but what God has commanded and appointed to be done*, is true indeed, but nothing to the Purpose. But if you speak of *Means of Grace in the largest Sense*, tis absolutely false, nay incoherent with what you said just now, viz. *that God may work Miracles by what Means he pleases*. For, if he can work *Miracles*, as most certainly he can, *by what Means he pleases*, he can work them by *Instruments*, which are not *strictly Means of Grace*, as the *Sacraments* are: unless you will maintain, that whatever *Instrument* God makes Use of to work *Miracles* by, becomes immediately a *Sacrament*, that is, a *Means of Grace strictly taken*; and then Saint Peter's Shadow, and all the *Aprons* and *Handkerchiefs*, which touch'd St Paul's Body, and wrought great *Miracles*, were *Sacraments*, or *Means of Grace strictly taken*.

Either therefore every Thing, by which God Works *Miracles*, is *strictly a Means of Grace*, or not: if it be, then the *Aprons* and *Handkerchiefs*, that touch'd St Paul's Body, were *strictly Means of Grace*: which is absurd. If not, then the *Reliques of Saints* may also work *Miracles* without being *strictly Means of Grace*. Whence it plainly appears, that whatever you have said, or can say concerning our *Multiplying Means of Grace* is wholly built upon the *Equivocal Meaning* of those Words; which you take a Pleasure to repeat even to a Surfeit for no other Rea-

son, but because they are *Equivocal*; and therefore proper to cast a Mist before ignorant People's Eyes.

» G. My Lord, as to the *Reliques* in your Church,
 » many of them have been notoriously detected;
 » and it has been found out, that the *Dead Bodies* of
 » *Malefactors* have been taken for the *Reliques* of
 » *Saints*, and great *Miracles* said to be done by them.
 » pag. 133.

« L. I hope, Sr, you do not mean, that great *Miracles* have been said to be done by *Bodies*, after they have been found out to be the *Bodies* of *Malefactors*. Nor do I believe upon your bare Word that *Miracles* have been attributed to the *Bodies* of *real Malefactors*, even before your pretended *notorious Detection* of them. Perhaps you only mean such a *notorious Malefactor* as *St Thomas of Canterbury*: who was found guilty of *high Treason*, and had all his *Goods confiscated* above three hundred Years after his Death, I may safely say by one of the most *ridiculous Farces*, that ever was acted upon the Theater of this World.

» G. The same *Relique*, as the *Head* or *Finger* of
 » such or such a *Saint* is shewn in several Places,
 » and each contend that *their's* is the *right*, and each
 » have *Miracles* avouch'd for them. pag. 133.

L. Sr, this was fully answer'd at our last Meeting upon the Subject of *Miracles*, [1. Part. §. 25.] to which I refer you.

» G. Many Instances of this with Vouchers undeniable you will find in the *Devotions of the Roman Church*. How then can you worship such *Reliques* in
 » *Faith*, without which it is a *Sin*? pag. 133.

L. Sr, I have already told you the true Meaning of *St Paul's* saying, *whatever is not of Faith is Sin*, viz. that whatever is done *against Conscience*, or with a *bad Intention*, is *Sin*: which may as well be applied to a Man Mistaking *Stockfish* for *Ling*, as to the Subject under

under Debate. For, suppose we should mistake *false Reliques* for *true ones*, the *Saint*, whose *Reliques* we suppose them to be, is still honour'd by us; and the Mistake is as innocent, as when we give an *Alms* for *God's Sake* to a *Cheat*; which is no uncommon Case.

But I observe once more, that whenever you speak of the *Respect* we pay to *Reliques*, you take Care to call it *Worship*; because the *Word* is *ambiguous* and may signify *Divine Worship*, as well as an *inferiour* or *Relative Honour*, and you piously hope that it will be taken in the *wrong Sense*. I therefore desire you to take Notice, that we *worship Reliques*, or the *Images of Christ* and his *Saints* no other wise than you *worship the Altar*, or the *Bible*, when you *bow* to it. If you deny that you *worship* them in *Paying* that *Respect* to 'em, we do the same. If you grant you *worship* them, then *Creatures* may be *worshipped* with a *Relative Honour*, and you cannot blame us for it.

In Effect no one *Word* is more *Equivocal* than the *Word Worship*, and it is manifest, that all Reasoning from such *Ambiguous Words* is nothing at the Bottom but *Fallacy* and *Amusement*, and a meer Design to confound and perplex People in Order to hide from them the *true State* of the *Question*. Pray, Sr, remember this, when you speak of *Images*, which I presume will come next upon the Board.

§. 17.

Of Images.

G. YEs, My Lord. For not only the *Saints*, and their *Reliques*, but their *Images* are with you made a distinct *Means of Grace*; For in the *Consecration* of the *Image* of a *Saint* it is said, that whoever shall worship such a *Saint*, *coram hac Imagine*,

„ before this Image, may obtain so and so, for which
 „ End the Image is blessed and sanctified. So that it is
 „ not enough to worship the Saint; but if I do it
 „ before such a consecrated Image, I shall obtain more
 „ Grace than otherwise. This makes the Image itself
 „ a Means of Grace, for there is Virtue there. Why
 „ else would it not do as well to pray, and not be-
 „ fore such an Image? Why else indeed are such
 „ Images so formally consecrated, if there be no Vir-
 „ tue in the Consecration? And why do Men go Pilgri-
 „ mages, or send Vows to Loretto, or any other dis-
 „ tant Place, if they think there is no Virtue in the
 „ Image there more than in forty of the same Sort,
 „ which they may have at Home? And the Saint re-
 „ presented by the Image is as near them in the one
 „ Place as in the other. There must then be some
 „ Virtue communicated to one Image more than to
 „ another. pag. 133. 134.

L. Sr, there were many Pools in Judæa besides the
 Pool call'd Betsheda. Joh. 5. v. 2. Yet God would on-
 ly cure the Sick in this. There were also many Rods
 besides the Rod of Moses, and many Aprons besides
 those, that touch'd the Body of Saint Paul; yet God
 wrought Miracles only by those. And why then may
 he not bestow a Blessing on one Place or Image more
 than another? And if he can do it, why should we not
 ask it of him? This, Sr, answers all your fine Queries.

But I shall instance in a Scriptural Fact resembling
 very much the Blessing or Consecration, with which
 you are pleased to make so much Mirth. It is writ-
 ten 1. Kings C. 8. that Salomon dedicated or consecrated
 the Temple, he had built in Jerusalem: And the whole
 Subject of the Prayer, or Form of Consecration is to beg
 of God, that whoever shall pray in or towards that
 House, may obtain so and so, as is specified in the
 Form of Consecration.

Now, Sr, let us suppose some *Atheistical Jew* should have reason'd thus in your Language. *The Temple is here made a distinct MEANS OF GRACE; for in the Consecration of the Temple it is said, that whoever shall worship God IN OR TOWARDS THAT HOUSE, MAY OBTAIN SO AND SO; for which End the Temple is blessed and sanctified. So that it is not enough to worship God, but if I do it IN OR TOWARDS SUCH A HOUSE, I shall obtain more grace than otherwise. This makes the House itself a MEANS OF GRACE; FOR THERE IS VIRTUE THERE. Why else should it not do as well to pray, and not IN, OR TOWARDS THAT HOUSE? Why else indeed is that House so formally consecrated, if there be no Virtue in the Consecration? And why do Men GO PILGRIMAGES, and SEND THEIR VOWS to the Temple in Jerusalem, if they think there is no Virtue in that House more than in any other Place? And God, who is worshipped in that House, IS AS NEAR US IN ONE PLACE AS ANOTHER. There must be then some virtue communicated to one House more than to another.*

Sr, whenever you answer this *prophane Discourse* of the supposed Jew, you will not be at a Loss for an Answer to your own.

ADVERTISEMENT.

The good-natured Lord in the former Conversation acquiesces to every Thing, his Adversary has said, and only tells him calmly, then you are against any Pictures or Images, or Paying any Honour to the holy Men departed: which gives Occasion to the Gentleman to answer thus.

G. **N**O, My Lord, we are not so stingy: We « scruple not *Pictures* for Ornament, but for « *Worship*, or for *Worshipping before them*, as you « call it. pag. 134. «

L. That's very strange indeed. Suppose you had a *Picture* or *Image* of *Christ crucified* before you, would you scruple to say your *Prayers*, or adore God with your Face turn'd towards it? But why do you not likewise scruple to pray with your Face turn'd towards the *Altar*, or *Communion Table*? for then you worship before it, as we do before *Pictures*: and we worship *Pictures* no otherwise than you worship the *Altar* or *Communion-Table* by *Bowing* to it, or *kneeling* before it.

§. 18.

The Church of England guilty of Incoherency.

G. **W**E also honour the *Saints departed* as far as we think it *Lawful*, and as we are verily persuaded, as far as they desire. pag. 134.

L. That's very well done, Sr, and we are verily persuaded, we do no more.

G. But according to *St Austin's Rule* before mention'd, if they accepted our *Adoration*, it would prove them to be *evil Spirits*: and then you are to consider, that instead of *Intercessors*, as you hope for by your *Worship* of them, they will vindicate themselves, and become your *Accusers*. pag. 134.

L. Sr, you should have said, according to *St Austin's Rule* before **FALSIFIED**. Pray learn to speak properly. For *St Austin* neither calls it *Adoration*, as you render it now, nor *Worship*, as you render'd it before, but **SACRIFICE**; and in plain Terms, *to be Worshiped AS GODS*. So that there is no Danger of their becoming our *Accusers*, as long as we only desire a *Part* in those *Prayers*, which they continually offer to God for the *Church Militant*. And this is all we desire of them.

G. But in the *Honour* we pay them, we first take

Care not to *specify* any particular Person as a *Saint*, but who is so recorded in *holy Scripture*. For we understand not *Canonizations* by Men, who know not the *Heart*. pag. 134. "

L. But when *Almighty God*, who knows the *Hearts* of Men, has manifested their *Holiness* by *evident Miracles*, are we allow'd to doubt of it? the *Ancient Fathers* were not so *Scrupulous*; for they invoked not only *Scriptural Saints*, but likewise those, whom the *living Voice* of the *Church* had *canonized*. Saint *Austin* pray'd to St *Cyprian*. L. 7. de Bapt. C. 1. St *Jerom* to St *Paula*. Epist. 27. St *Gregory Nyssen* to St *Theodore*. Tom. 3. p. 585. C. and St *Gregory Nazianzen* to St *Basil*. Orat. 20. T. 1. p. 373. B. And they invoked them by *Name*, and call'd them *Saints*, tho not recorded in *holy Scripture*, which it seems your *tender Conscience* will not allow of.

However, good Sr, your *Church* is not so *scrupulous* as you would make her. Pray read the *Calendar* of your *Common Prayer-Book*. For there you will find several *Saints* specified by *Name*, and not recorded in *Holy Scriptures*; which I hope will help to cure you of the squeamish fit, you are fallen into.

G. In the next Place, My Lord, we limit the *Honour* we pay to *Saints* by the *Rule* of *God's Commandments*, which we suppose most pleasing to them. pag. 134. "

L. Do you only suppose it, Sr? Nay we are sure of it. For how should any Thing, that is *displeasing* to *God*, be *Pleasing* to the *Saints*?

G. We keep particular *Holy Days* for the *Apostles*, St *John Baptist*, St *Stephen*, &c. we bless *God* for them, commemorate their *Virtues*, and pray that we may follow their *Example*. pag. 135. "

L. So far then we agree. And, if keeping *Holy Days* be any part of *Christian Devotion*, as I presume

it is, this is just what we mean by what we call, *Religious Honour*.

» G. We have one Day for all the *Saints* in *General*, and another for *St Michael*, and all the *Angels*. Thus we *honour* them. *pag. 135.*

L. Sr, I am glad to hear it; For all this is very good *Popery*.

» G. For this, My Lord, we bear the *Reproach* of our *four Dissenters*, as if we were too much Inclining to *Popery*. You think we give too little *Honour* to the *Saints*, and they think we give too much, but I hope we keep the *Mean*. *pag. 135.*

L. Sr, notwithstanding your *pretended Mean*, your *Church* cannot avoid Splitting upon one of these *Rocks*. For, if it be forbid to pay any Sort of *Religious Worship* or *Honour* to the *Saints*, your keeping *holy Days* in *Honour* of them is unjustifiable. But if there be an *Honour* due to 'em, and if it be Lawful to pay them that *Honour* by keeping *solemn Days* in Memory of them; to refuse after that to pay a *Relative Honour* to the *Pictures*, that represent them, or the *Reliques* that were a Part of them, is perfectly inconsistent with common Sense; and the *Mean*, you boast of, is no better than a practical Contradiction to the Principle you allow of. Because Reason itself, and the Practice of all Mankind tells us, that when a Person has a just Title to be *honour'd* by us, we may lawfully pay a *Respect* to Things, that have a near *Relation* to him; and when this Title is wholly grounded upon a *Motive* of Religion; as when we *honour* a Person whether *Dead* or *alive* meerly for *Supernatural Gifts* bestow'd upon him by *God*, then the *Honour* we pay him is not *Civil*, but *Religious*. And such is by Consequence the *Honour*, you pay to *Saints* and *Angels*, when you keep *holy Days* in Memory of them.

For this Reason the *four Dissenters* (as you call them) laugh at you as meer *Botchers* in the *Reforming Trade*. For whoever will set up for a *Reformer* of the publick *Faith* or *Discipline* of his *Mother-Church*, must go thoroug-stitch with the *Work*. Otherwise he do's *enough* to be condemn'd by the *Church*, from which he *separates* himself, and *too little* to avoid the *Reproach* of Falling into *Incoherencies*. Because what he leaves *unreform'd* rises for the most Part in Judgment against him, and kicks down some Article of his *pretended Reformation*.

§. 19.

The Subject of Images resumed.

G. **V**VE abstain from the *Pictures* or *Images* of the *Saints* in our *Churches*, because they have been abused to *Superstition*, and to avoid *Offence*. But in Places not dedicated to *Worship*, as in our private *Houses*, we think them not unlawful more than the *Picture* of any good Man.
 pag. 135. "

L. Truly, Sr, the *Saints* are very much obliged to you for Allowing them a Place in your *private Houses* amongst those of *Good Men*. However I think the *Apostles* at least have some Reason to take it ill, that *Moses* and *Aaron*, whose *Pictures* are admitted into many of your *Churches*, should be *preferr'd* before them.

G. *Epiphanius* was very zealous against having them brought into *Churches*: and tells *John Bishop* of *Jerusalem* in a Letter translated by *St Jerom*, that finding a linnen Cloth hang up in a *Church-door* (it is likely to keep out the *Wind*) whereon was a *Picture* of *Christ*, or of some *Saint*, he tore it, and

» order'd a Dead Corps to be buried in it. And he
 » lamented the *Superstition* he saw coming by these
 » *Pictures* and *Images* then beginning to creep into the
 » Church. pag. 135.

L. Sr, all we can gather from this Story of St *Epiphanius* is, that he judg'd, that the ancient *Pagan Idolatry* was not yet then so utterly abolish'd (as it certainly was not at that Time in many Places) but that the Use of *Images* or *Pictures* in Churches might be an Occasion to revive it. He therefore did his Duty in Opposing the Use of them: And 'tis what any Bishop or Pastor would do at present, if he had the same rational Motive to induce him to it. For 'tis certain the Church never obliged the Faithful to the actual Use or Veneration of *Images* or *Pictures* as a Thing essential to Christianity. On the contrary 'tis a Point of Discipline only, which was not universally practis'd; till Idolatry was utterly extinguish'd in Christendom. But since that Time the Church had Reason to declare, that the *Images of Christ and his Saints are to be retain'd, and that a due Honour and Veneration is to be given them.* Conc. Trid. Sess. 25.

» G. My Lord, the Abuse of Things tho other-
 » wise Lawful, which are not instituted by God for
 » standing Means of Grace, as Baptism and the Lord's
 » Supper may justly take away the Use of them.
 » pag. 136.

L. That's very true, Sr; But 'tis not fit for a private Man to make himself Judge to determine whether they are abused or not.

» G. The Brazen Serpent was appointed by God as
 » a Means of Grace for miraculous Cures in the Wilderness, and was preserved until the Days of He-
 » zekiah. 2. King. 18. v. 4. But when they burned In-
 » cense to it, it became an Idol, was broke to Pieces,
 » and call'd by a contemptible Name *Nebushtan*:
 that

that is, a Bit of Brass. How much more Reason is there to remove the *Pictures* and *Images* of *Saints* (which God never appointed) out of our *Churches*, when wee see *Incense* burnt to them, and they *Worshipped* in your *Churches* as *Means of Grace*? And yet there is no Evil in the *Pictures* themselves. pag. 136. "

L. Sr, the *Pictures* and *Images* of *Saints* are neither *Worshipped in*, nor out of our *Churches* as *Means of Grace*; nor do we believe any intrinick *Virtue* in them. But this pretty Conceit of our pretended *Means of Grace* tickles your *Fancy* so powerfully, that you cannot hold *Thrusting* it in every where by *Head* and *Shoulders*, whether there be *Occasion* for it or not.

As to what you say, that we burn *Incense* to them, Sr, we burn *Incense* to one another in the same Manner as we do to *Pictures*: And yet I hope we are not so mad as to make *Idols* of, or pay *Divine Honour* to one another. There are several *Ways* of *Shewing Respect* both to *God* and *Man*. We bow to *God*, and we bow to *Men*. We also kneel to *God*, and so we do to *Men*. But, tho the outward *Action* be the same, I presume the *Respect* we shew by it is not so. For 'tis strictly *Adoration*, or *Divine Worship* when we kneel to *God*, and only an *inferiour Respect*, when we kneel to *Men*.

Now, Sr, one *Way* of shewing our *Respect* is that of *Burning Incense*, which is an *Action* as *indifferent* in itself, as that of *Bowing* or *Kneeling*. So that as *Bowing* or *Kneeling* are not appropriated to *God alone*, nor always used as an *Indication* of *Divine Excellency* in the *Thing*, or *Person* we honour by those *Actions*, so neither is the *Use* of *Incense* amongst *Christians*. When we offer it to *God*, we signify by it the *Sovereign Honour*, we owe him: but when to *Creatures*, it is no more than a *Ceremony* to express the *Respect*

we have for them on Account of the *Relation* they have to *God*.

Bellarmin L. 2. de *Missa* C. 15. shews the *Antiquity* of this Ceremony ; and the Significations of it are many, and all tending to excite *Piety* and *Devotion* in the Faithful : as, to put us in Mind of the *Inaccessible Glory* of *God*, who appear'd in a *Cloud*, and the *sweet Odour* of our *Prayers*, if sent up from a Heart inflamed with *Divine Love*.

G. But, My Lord, the *Scripture* tells us, that *Hezekiah* broke the *Brazen Serpent*, because the *Children of Israel* burnt *Incense* to it : which shews that their *Burning Incense* to it made it become an *Idol*.

L. Sr, tis very certain, that the *Israelits* in Process of Time made an *Idol* of the *Brazen Serpent* : And therefore *Hezekiah* made no Difference between it, and the *Statues* set up in the *high Places*, which were certainly *Idols*, and worshipped as such by the *Jews*. So that altho they had but bow'd or kneel'd to them, it would have been an *Act* of *Idolatry* : Because any *Respect* whatsoever shewn to an *Idol* is an *Idolatrous Worship*. But their *Burning Incense* to the *Brazen Serpent* was a *Special Act* of *Idolatry* in a *Jew*, because the *Burning of Incense* by Way of a *Religious Respect* was appropriated to *God* by a *Ceremonial Part* of the *Mosaic Law*. *Exod.* 29. v. 13. *Levit* 7. v. 5. &c. and there was an *Altar* deputed particularly for it. *Luke* 1. v. 11. But there is not any Precept in the *Gospel* either *Commanding*, or *Forbidding* the Use of *Incense* to *Christians*, or *Appropriating* it to *God* : And where no Law is, there is no *Transgression*. *Rom.* 4. v. 15. And by Consequence the Use of *Incense* amongst *Christians* even by Way of a *Religious Honour* is a Thing as indifferent as the Actions of *Bowing* or *Kneeling*, which I presume do not make *Idols* of the *Persons* or *Things*, towards which they are used.

§. 20.

Concerning Images of God.

G. **B**Ut, My Lord, I think there is one *Picture* " has Evil in it, and is unlawful any where: " And yet it is seen in your *Churches*, and common- " ly over the *Altar*. That is, the *Picture* or *Image* of " *God the Father*, like an *Old Man*, &c. We are " forbid to *make* it, and then we cannot *worship* it. " See how positively God forbids it, *Deut. 4. v. 15.* " &c. *take good Heed unto yourselves* (for you saw no " *Manner of Similitude*, that is, of God, in the *Day* " *that the Lord spake unto you*) ----- *least you corrupt* " *yourselves*, and *make you a graven Image*, the *Simili-* " *tude of any Figure*, the *likeness of Male or Female*, &c. " And again. *They changed the Glory of the incorruptible* " *God into an Image like to corruptible Man*, &c. *Rom. 1. v. 23. pag. 136.* "

L. Sr, this latter *Text* of *St Paul* condemns the *Pagan Worship* of *Idols*, as I have shew'd before: And the *Consequence* you draw from it is, that *therefore it is unlawful to make any Picture or Image of God*. And is not this *Arguing* with most exquisite *Skill*!

But I presume the *Text* of *Deuteronomy* is to supply all *Defects*: For it is introduced with *Sound of Trumpet*, and I am summon'd by you to see how positively it forbids the *Making any Picture*, or *Image of God*. Truly, *Sr*, when I first heard myself thus solemnly call'd upon, see how positively God forbids it, I apprehended nothing less, than to find in some of the four *Evangelists* this *Commandement* in express *Terms*, *Thou shalt not make a Picture or Image of God the Father like an old Man*. But the *Text*, you have

quoted, has very much relieved me; finding especially, that it is not in any of the *Gospels*, but only in *Deuteronomy*, which contains indeed the *Jewish ceremonial Law*, but meddles not with the Discipline of the *Christian Church*. However since you desire it so earnestly of me, I will do what I can to see the *positive Prohibition* you speak of. But as yet I can only see two Things, and those I see very plainly. *First*, that there is no such *positive Prohibition* in the *Text* you have quoted: and *2dly*, that were there such a Prohibition in that *Text*, it would make nothing against us.

As to the *first*, to convince you that I am not mistaken, let us have the *Text* entire, which is thus. *Take ye therefore good Heed unto yourselves (For ye saw no Manner of Similitude on the Day that the Lord spake unto you in Horeb out of the Midst of the Fire) v. 15. Least ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven Image; the Similitude of any Figure, the Likeness of Male or Female. v. 16. The Likeness of any Beast, that is on the Earth, the Likeness of any winged Foul, that flieth in the Air. v. 17. The Likeness of any Thing that creepeth on the Ground, the Likeness of any Fish, that is in the Waters beneath the Earth. v. 18. And least thou lift up thine Eyes unto Heaven, and when thou Seest the Sun and the Moon, and the Stars, even all the Host of Heaven, thou shouldst be driven to worship them, and serve them, which the Lord thy God has divided unto all Nations under the Heaven. v. 19.*

This, Sr, is the whole *Text*; and I observe *first*, that these Words (*for ye saw no Manner of Similitude on the Day, that the Lord spake unto you in Horeb*) are no Part of the *Law*, or *Commandment* here deliver'd by *Moses*. For they are placed within a *Parenthesis*, which separates and distinguishes them from the Words of the *Law*. Neither do they command or for-

bid any Thing, but nakedly relate a *Matter of Fact*. Nay they are thus placed within a *Parenthesis* in your own Bible.

Whence I observe 2dly, that the *Law* itself is entirely contain'd in these *Words*. Take ye therefore good Heed unto yourselves least you corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven Image, the Similitude of any Figure, the Likeness of Male or Female, the Likeness of any Beast that is on the Earth, the Likeness of any winged Foul that flieth in the Air, the Likeness of any Thing that creepeth on the Earth, the Likeness of any Fish, that is in the Waters beneath the Earth, &c.

Now, Sr, tho I have at present both my Eyes open, I want your Spectacles to see in what *Words* God here positively forbids any Image, Likeness, or Similitude to be made of himself. 'Tis true, I plainly see these three *Words*, Image, Likeness, and Similitude: But I likewise see the Things, they are referr'd to, expressly specified, viz. the Likeness of a Male or Female, of Beasts, of Fish, of Foul, and Creeping Things: and these the Jews were positively forbid to make by the Text you have quoted: But I am yet too blind to see the Force of this Consequence, ergo, that Text positively forbids any Image to be made of God.

G. But, My Lord, tho these *Words*, for you saw no Manner of Similitude on the Day that the Lord spoke unto you in Horeb, be no Part of the Law, yet they are at least the Reason of the Law, and that suffices to make Good the Consequence I draw from them.

L. No, Sr, they are not even the Reason of the Law. For tho God should have appear'd to the People in some visible Likeness, as he did afterwards to Daniel, yet the Reason of the Law would have been the same; viz. to keep the People out of the Occasion of Idolatry, to which they were excessively inclined.

G. But was it then lawful for the Jews to make Images of God?

L. I do not say it was ; nor is it any Thing to the Purpose , whether it was or not. All I pretend to maintain is , that it was not forbid by the *Text* you have quoted ; on which nevertheless you lay as much Stress , as if it were Nothing inferiour to a Demonstration.

G. But , My Lord , to what End was it then , that *Moses* put the People in Mind , that they saw no Similitude of God in *Horeb* , if it was not to insinuate , that God forbid them to make any Image of himself ?

L. Sir , this is only a *Guß* or Inference of your own , but no Part of the Law itself , as I have clearly shew'd : And therefore comes very short of your former Triumphant Expression , SEE HOW POSITIVELY GOD FORBIDS IT ! However , since you will needs oblige me to give a Reason , why *Moses* put the People in Mind , that they saw no Similitude of God in *Horeb* , I conceive that *Moses* put them in Mind of it for the very same Reason for which Almighty God did not shew himself to the People in any visible Likeness . And if I maybe allow'd to guess why he did not then shew himself in such a Manner , it appears to me most probable , that it was to prevent their Entertaining an *Erroneous Idea* of God , and Imagining him to be a corporeal being ; as that gross and carnal People would have been apt enough to do. But to pretend that barely Mentioning a *Fact* implies a *positive Prohibition* any more than the *Fact* itself is not I think agreeable to common Sense. And I never heard any Man say , that God's not Appearing to the People in a visible Likeness was any more a *positive Prohibition* to make an Image of him , than his Appearing in a visible Likeness to *Daniel* was a *positive Command* to make one.

But let us now suppose the Jews were *positively forbid* by this Law of *Deuteronomy* to make any Image of

God, did not the same Law as positively forbid them to make *Images of Men or Women; of Fish, or Foul, or Beasts, or Creeping Things?* And are *Christians* concern'd in that *Law*? If so, then all the *Statues* in the *Royal Exchange*, and Thousands more must be pull'd down; the *Lion and Unicorn* must be removed out of your *Churches*, and all *Statuaries* banish'd out of *Christendom*. 'Tis therefore manifest, that the whole *Text*, you have quoted, contains only a *Ceremonial Law*, and is by Consequence as little to the Purpose (allowing even that it *positively forbids* the Making any *Image of God*) as if you had quoted the *Law of Circumcision* to prove the Point in Question.

It is indeed a Thing unlawful in *Christians* as well as *Jews* to have *Pictures or Images of God* so as to think them to be Representations of the *Divine Nature*; and there needs no more to forbid this than the very first Principles of reveal'd Religion.

G. Pray, My Lord, did you ever know a *Painter* or *Statuary*, who attempted to draw a *Picture*, or make an *Image of a Thought, or of a Soul?* And is not the great God more *invisible*, and the *Divine Nature* much more *incomprehensible* even to our *Thoughts or Imaginations?* How then can it be represented to our *Eyes?* I dare say there never was a Man since *Adam*, who would own any such Thing, or ever had so foolish a Thought. No, but when they drew any *Picture or Similitude of God*, it was only meant to express some of his *Attributes or Perfections*. As by *Fire* his *Purity*: by a *Giant* with many *Hands* his *Power*, with many *Eyes* his *Providence*, &c. And so you own, that by an *Old Man* you only mean to express his *Antiquity*. And will not this excuse the *Heathen* as well as you? See the same excuse made by *Maximus Tyrius*. *Diff. 38. Whether Statues were to be made for the Gods?* But

» here you would put an *impossible Meaning* upon the
 » *Prohibition of God* to make it of no Effect; and
 » which will excuse the *Heathens* as well as yoursel-
 » ves. pag. 137. 138.

L. Sr, if Making *Images* or *Pictures* of the *true God*, that is, Representing him in that *visible Likeness*, in which he has really shew'd himself to Men; if this I say be the same as Making *Images* of *false Gods*, then I will allow that the *Heathens* may in this Respect be excused as well as we. But I forget, alas, that the *Heathen Jupiter* was the *true God*, as you have labour'd hard to prove him. Tho *Origen*, and the primitive Christians believed him to be a *Devil*: And as I am altogether of their Mind, I think that Drawing *Pictures* and *Similitudes* to honour the *Devil* is not quite so excusable as Doing it to honour *God*.

Now let us see what may be said to your first ingenious Question. Viz. *Whether I ever knew a Painter or Statuary, who attempted to draw a Picture or make an Image of a Thought?* To which I answer directly, that at what Time soever a *Thought* shall appear in a *visible Shape* or *Likeness*, I will then bring you acquainted with a *Painter* or *Statuary*, who shall attempt to draw a *Picture*, or make an *Image* of it. I answer 2^{dly}, that no *Picture* can be made of a *Thought*, or any spiritual Thing so as to be a true Representation of it's proper Nature.

But here you make a second Assault upon me, and ask again, *And is not the great God more invisible, and the Divine Nature more incomprehensible even to our Thoughts and Imaginations? How then can it be represented to our Eyes?* Sr, the *Divine Nature* is infinite, invisible, and incomprehensible, and therefore can no more be represented as it is in itself than a *Thought*. But the *Likeness*, in which *God* has appear'd, may be represented:

sented: For I presume there are *Painters*, that can draw the *Pictures*, and *Statuaries* that can make the *Images* of an *Old Man*, and a *Dove*: And you cannot be so ignorant of Scripture-history, as not to know, that *God the Father* appear'd to *Daniel* in the *Likeness* of an *Old Man*, and *God the Holy Ghost* appear'd at our Saviour's Baptism in the *Likeness* of a *Dove*. These *Corporeal Figures* therefore may lawfully be painted; Nay that of the *Holy Ghost* in the *Likeness* of a *Dove* is to be seen in all your *Common-Prayer-Books*, that are printed with *Cuts*: Which by the by is a full Confutation of the Paradox you maintain, viz. *that it is unlawful to make the Picture of God the Father like an Old Man*. For the *Holy Ghost* is as truly *God* as the *Father*; and if it be lawful to paint the *Holy Ghost* like a *Dove*, as your *Church* makes no Scruple to do, how it should be unlawful to paint the *Father* like an *Old Man* is a Mystery wholly incomprehensible to my weak Understanding.

All then that is unlawful or forbid in these and other such like Pictures is to imagine, that any corporeal Figure can be a true Representation of the Divinity itself. But this you say is putting an impossible Meaning upon the Prohibition of God: and you dare averr there never was a Man since Adam, who would own any such Thing, or ever had so foolish a Thought. What, Sr! has there never been a Man since Adam capable of such a Foolish Thought! If I mistake not, I can name you a great many. For surely the *Hereticks* call'd *Audians* lived since the Time of Adam; and they held that *God the Father* had a human Shape with *Arms*, *Hands*, *Legs*, &c. that *Adam's* Likeness to *God* was in his *Body*; and that *Christ* sits literally at the right Hand of *God the Father*.

2dly, *Tertullian* a Wit of the first Rank thought the Soul a Corporeal Substance. Nothing (says he) is incorporeal, but that which is Nothing. L. de carne Christi.

ti. C. 11. And again. *God is a Spirit. But who will deny that he is a Body? A Spirit is one Sort of Body, and has it's own Shape.* L. contra Prax. C. 7.

Lastly, St Paul thought it proper to admonish even the wise *Athenians*, that there can be no true *Like-ness* made of God. *We ought not to think (says he) that the GODHEAD IS LIKE UNTO GOLD OR SILVER, OR STONE GRAVEN BY ART, AND MAN'S DEVICE. And the Time of THIS IGNORANCE God Winked at, but now commands all Men every where to repent.* Act. 17. v. 29. 30. 'Tis therefore evident that some Men since *Adam* were so ignorant as to think the *God-head* like to the *Statues of Gold or Silver graven by Art and Man's Device.* And I hope you will not take it ill, if I rather think you grossly out in maintaining the contrary, than that St Paul was mistaken, or spoke impertinently to the *Athenians*.

'Tis certain the *Heathens* Worshipp'd their *Idols* as Gods. *Turn ye not unto Idols, nor make to yourselves molten Gods.* Lev. 19. v. 4. And the *Israelits* said of the golden Calf, *these are the Gods, that brought thee out of Egypt.* And again. *They changed their Glory into the Similitude of a Calf that eateth Grass.* Psal. 106. v. 20.

§. 21.

Of Heathen Idols, and the Golden Calf.

» G. MY Lord, it is absurd to say, that the *Hea-*
 » *thens* thought their *Images* to be the
 » Things, of which they were the *Images*. That was
 » impossible; for then they would not be the *Ima-*
 » *ges*, but the *Things* themselves. Who ever said,
 » that a Man's *Picture* was himself? Tho they are
 » call'd the *Persons*; as when we look upon *Pictures*

we say, *this is such or such a Man*. But if any should “ put it upon us , that we mean the *Persons* them- “ selves , we must think them *Idiots* or *School-men* , “ that love Distinctions and *Wrangling*. *Maximus* “ *Tyrinus* in the *Desertation* before quoted tells us , “ that they had many *Images* of the same God , as “ of *Venus* , *Diana* , &c. and yet they did not think “ there was more than one *Venus* , or one *Diana*. Have “ you not Multitudes of the *Pictures* and *Images* of the “ *Virgin Mary* ? And yet you say not that there is “ more than one such *Virgin*. Now the *Heathens* “ worshipped their *Images* ; and if you believe your “ own *Catechism* , you must think , that they took “ every one for God. For , *hec omnia* , they worship- “ ped all these as God. “

And it is as absurd to think , that they took “ that *Serpent* or *Beast* , whose *Image* they made , to “ be God. Or if they meant not any particular *Ser- “ pent* or *Ox* (for Example) by the *Image* , they must “ think every *Ox* or *Serpent* to be God ! But they “ were not so ridiculous ; as *Maximus Tyrinus* , and all “ as many of them as have wrote will satisfy you. “ But they made Use of their *Images* only as *Symbols* , “ which being *dedicated* to such a God. They thought “ that this God would afford his Presence with his “ *Symbol* , and by it secure to them his favour , and “ Protection. How near your *Consecration* comes to “ their *Dedication* of *Images* , I leave you to Judge. “ But you put such monstrous Things upon the *Hea- “ thens* , as they disown , detest , and abhor. And yet “ you must do it , that your Case and theirs may not “ appear so very like. pag. 138. 139. “

L. Sr. This Reflection together with your Com-
paring our *Blessing* of *Images* with the *Heathen Con-
secration* of *Idols* is equally scurrilous and unjust.

You say , we charge the *Heathens* with *Absurdities*

only to *acquit* ourselves ; but it is very apparent , you *acquit* the *Heathens* only to load us with *Infamy*. And indeed the *tender concern* you shew upon all Occasions for the *Reputation* of the *Heathens* would make one think you have adopted them into the Number of your *Protestant Brethren*. But why should this surprise me ? Since you own that you and they are united in the *Worship* of one and the *same God*. Their *Jupiter* , (as you have endeavour'd to prove) was the *true God* , and by Consequence is so still. Their *Inferiour Gods* were but *Symbols* of his *Divine Perfections* : Their *Statues* were not worshipped as *God* , and the *Sacrifices* they offer'd to 'em , were but a *relative Honour* , which wholly *terminated* in the *true God*. And who would not now be ambitious to communicate with such *true Worshippers of God* ! Really , Sr , I am almost grown fond of their Company , and begin to think you have done the *Papists* a great Deal of Honour in putting them upon the same Foot with the *Heathens*.

G. *Bantering* , My Lord , is easier than *Answering*. But I should be glad to hear you say something to the Reasons I have given to prove that the *Heathens* could not be guilty of the *Absurdities* , you lay to their Charge.

L. Sr , you have effectually proved them to be gross *Absurdities* , and I readily grant them to be so. But is that a good Proof , that the *Heathens* were not guilty of them ? Or was their *Religion* so very *Rational* , that no *Absurdity* could be a Part of it ? How happy would Mankind be , if Proving a Thing to be *Absurd* were a Demonstration , that no Man ever was , or could be guilty of it ! I assure you , Sr , this Argument would relieve you in many Occasions , and be of good Service to many more besides yourself. One very important Consequence at least

would follow from it, viz. that there is no such Thing as *Mahometanism* in the World: For it is a Religion fill'd with the grossest *Absurdities* according to the Notion all Christians have of it. We must therefore conclude it is impossible that such wise Men, as many of the *Turks* are, should be serious Professors of it. And it will follow from your Way of arguing, that we make *Monsters* of them only to hide our own *Deformity*.

I have heard of a Book lately printed, which pretends to prove, that if Men had *Faith*, they would be *Immortal*; and that it is a Man's own Fault if he dies; which is so *excessively absurd*, that, according to your ingenious Way of Arguing, I must say the Book was never writ. And yet it is *plain Fact*, that it was writ and printed, and is to be sold by the Booksellers of *London* and *Westminster*. And so it is *plain Fact*, that the *Heathens* worshipped their *Idols* as *Gods* in Spite of all your Arguments to prove the *Absurdity* of it. For the Question between you and me is not, whether their so Doing was *absurd*, but whether it be true in *Fact* that they did so.

G. But, My Lord, *Maximus Tyrius* a *Heathen Writer*, who surely knew his own Religion denies positively, that they believed their *Images* to be *Gods*.

L. Sr, *Maximus Tyrius* is not the only *Writer*, who overcome by the Strength and Multitude of Reasons against him has been compell'd to recede from his own Principles. But be that as it will, I ask whether *Maximus Tyrius* or the *Word of God* is to be believed by *Christians*? Supposing then that *Maximus Tyrius* is for you, I am sure the *Word of God* is flatly against you. For besides the plain Words I have already quoted from *Leviticus*, and numberless Places of Scripture, which I omit for Brevity's

Sake, the following Text of *Isaiah* is decisive. *The Residue thereof he maketh a GOD, even his graven Image. He falleth down unto it, and worshippeth it, and prayeth unto it, and sayeth, deliver me, FOR THOU ART MY GOD. Isa. 44. v. 17.*

Nay *Jeremy* charges the *House of Israel* with the same Extravagance. *As the Thief is ashamed, when he is found, so is the House of Israel ashamed, they, their Kings, their Princes, and their Priests, and their Prophets saying TO A STOCK, thou art my Father, and TO A STONE, thou hast brought me forth. Jer. 2. v. 26. 27.* And are we after this to consult *Maximus Tyrius* to know, whether the *Heathens* believed their *Idols* to be *Gods*? I have hitherto thought the *Word of God* to be *Infallible*; but it seems *Maximus Tyrius* is to be believed before it.

However I think you cannot deny, but that *Minusius Felix*; and *Arnobius* the *Philosopher* are two as creditable *Witnesses* as *Maximus Tyrius*. Now the former of these (in *Octavio*) speaks thus to the *Heathens*. *Behold an Idol is cast, 'tis work'd, 'tis hew'd; 'tis not yet a God, 'tis leaded, 'tis fix'd, 'tis set up; 'tis not yet a God, 'tis adorn'd, 'tis consecrated, 'tis pray'd to, then 'tis a God.* And the *Philosopher Arnobius* after his *Conversion* to *Christianity* laments his past Folly in these pathetick *Words*, *I lately revered O Blindness! Statues taken from the Furnace, GODS HAMMER'D UPON THE ANVIL ----- as if it had a secret Virtue I flatter'd it, I spoke to it, I made Requests to an INSENSIBLE STOCK. L. 1. contra Gentes.* This, Sr; I think is Answer enough to your *Maximus Tyrius*.

But what do you think of the *Golden Calf*? For either *Moses* relates a *Falseness*, or the *Israelits* worshipped it as a *God*.

» G. I perceive, My Lord, you must draw in the
» *Jews* too, else all will stand you in no Stead. And

you have no Mercy upon them. You suppose them “ full as ignorant as you have made the *Heathen*. “ They must believe that the *Golden Calf* on the same “ *Day* they made it, to be the *Great God*, who made “ themselves and all the *World*, and to have “ brought them out of *Agypt* long before itself was “ made. But the *Jews* will not let this go with you “ more than the *Heathen*: They were not quite so “ foolish. pag. 139. 140. “

L. What, Sr! Have you got another *Maximus Tyrinus* to baffle the *Word* of God once more?

G. My Lord, the *Jews* had seen *Osiris* worship- “ ped in *Agypt* under the Figure of an *Ox*, from “ which they took their Figure of the *Calf*. And it “ was to secure God's Presence amongst them upon the “ supposed Loss of *Moses*, by whom they had re- “ ceived their Law from God, and Directions from “ him upon all Occasion. But *Moses* had been ab- “ sent from them 40 Days, and took neither Meat “ nor Drink with him; so that they thought he had “ been quite gone or Dead, and that they should see “ him no more. And then how should they do to se- “ cure the Presence of God amongst them? p. 140. “

L. To be sure, the Making a *Golden Calf* was a most infallible Expedient.

G. They took to this *Way* of an *Image* or *Sym- “ bol* of God, not that they forsook God, but to take “ Care that he might not forsake them. And they “ meant his *Worship* in that of the *Golden Calf*. “ Therefore they proclaim'd the *Dedication* of it a “ *Feast unto the Lord*. *Exod.* 32. v. 5. And that it was “ wholly for *Want* of *Moses* they did it (by whom “ they had found by long Experience the Presence “ of God secured among them) they themselves “ gave the Reason. *Up*, said they, *make us Gods*, “ *which shall go before us. For as for this Moses, the Man*

» that brought us up out of the Land of Egypt, we wot not
» what is become of him. pag. 140. 141.

L. Well, Sr, you almost make me admire both the *Religious Zeal*, and *ingenious Fancy* of the Jews. Their *Religious Zeal* in taking such effectual Care to secure to themselves, the Presence of God, and their *ingenious Fancy* in Doing it by the Image of a Calf. For I own a Calf is some thing like an Ox; and I find I must not question, but the *Egyptian Ox* call'd *Osiris* was but a *Symbol* of the true God. And so, allowing only for the Difference in Age between the *Jewish Calf*, and the *Egyptian Ox*, you have proved to a Demonstration, that the true God was worshipped by the Jews under the *Symbol* of the golden Calf. Thus with the Force of your Eloquence you have clear'd the World both of *Heathen* and *Jewish Idolatry* to make Room for *Popish Idolatry* alone.

But, Sr, give me Leave to ask you one Question. Do you believe the *Scriptures*?

G. My Lord, I think I do.

L. Well then, Sr, you must drop all your fine Reasons, and believe *Moses* saying, *He* (i. e. *Israel*) FORSOOK God, which made him, and went back from the God of his Salvation. ---- Thou hast FORSAKEN the God, which made thee, and hast FORGOTTEN the God thy Creator. Deut. 32. v. 15. 18. You must likewise believe the *Psalmist* saying. They made à Calf in *Horeb*, and worshipped the molten Image. Thus they changed their Glory into the Similitude of an Ox, that eateth Grass. They FORGOT God, who had saved them, who had done so great Things in Egypt, &c. Ps. 105. v. 19. Lastly, you must believe *St Stephen* speaking thus to the Jews. Our Fathers would not obey, but THRUST him (i. e. the true God) from them, and in their Hearts turned back into Egypt, Saying unto Aaron, make us Gods to go before us. And they made a Calf in those Days.

Days, and offer'd Sacrifice to their Idol, and rejoiced in the Work of their own Hands. Act. 7. v. 39. 40.

Now, Sr, if you believe these sacred *Texts*, as you profess to do, you are bound to retract what you said just now, viz. *that the Israelits did not FORSAKE God, but only took Care that he should not forsake them.* For 'tis a flat Contradiction to all the three *Texts.* *Moses* says, and repeats it twice, that they FORSOOK God: you say expressly, *they did NOT FORSAKE him.* Either therefore *Moses* or you are in the Wrong. Again the *Psalmist* says, *that they FORGOT God who had saved them*; and *St Stephen* tells them, *that they THRUST GOD from them, and in their Hearts turned back into Egypt.* You on the contrary averr, *that they only took Care, that God should not forsake them:* which you express in stronger Terms thus, *that it was to secure God's Presence among them.* Here then again either you, or both *David* and *St Stephen* are mistaken. For if it be true, that *the Israelits only took Care to secure God's Presence to them*, it must be false that they FORGOT HIM, and THRUST HIM AWAY from them. But if it be true, that they FORGOT him, and THRUST HIM AWAY from them (as I hope it is) then it must be false, *that they only took Care to secure his Presence among them.* Because a Man, who is only solicitous to secure God's Presence to him, cannot be said either to forget him; or thrust him away from him.

I must therefore advise you as a Friend to be hereafter more wary what you say. For tho by Contradicting the general Sense of Mankind you only render yourself guilty of Singularity or Nonsense (which your Zeal against Popery will atone for amongst your Protestant Brethren) yet Contradicting the plain Word of God is barefaced Impiety, which the very warmest zeal against Popery will not excuse.

But suppose there were no *Texts* directly against you, the very Circumstances of the Fact, as related by *Moses*, demonstrate the Falsehood of your Assertion. For, if the *Israelites* did not forsake God, but only took Care to secure God's Presence among them, how could their Crime be of so hainous a Nature, as Almighty God himself represents it to *Moses*, *Exod. 32. 7. 8. 9. &c.* Or why should *Moses* express his extreme Abhorrence of it by such an extraordinary Transport of zeal, as was that of his *Breaking in Pieces the Tables* written with God's own Hands? *ψ. 19.* Why did he reproach *Aaron* so bitterly for his Compliance with the People's Request, and call it *peccatum Maximum*, a most grievous Sin? *ψ. 21.* Finally, why did he command the *Levites* to destroy to the Number of 23000 of those, who in all Likelihood had been the most forward in the Matter? *ψ. 27. 28.* Pray, Sr, answer me these Questions; and shew how these Facts can be reconciled with your Saying, that *the Jews did not forsake God, but only took Care, that he might not forsake them.*

„ G. My Lord (to conclude this Subject of *Images*) let me ask you, suppose it were made *Treasure* to draw the *Picture* of the King, or to bow to it; would you venture your *Life* upon all the *Distinctions* and *Excuses*, which are made for the *Pictures* of God? Yet you venture your *Souls* upon it, if it be a *Sin*: tho you think it may be beneficial to you, as Putting you in Mind of him, or Paying Respect unto him.

„ Now learn by this how dangerous a Thing it is to make *Means of Grace* of your own *Invention*, and to think that by your *Consecrations* and *Dedications* without *Warrant* of God's Word you can secure his Presence with you, and procure the *Grace* of Health, or any Benefit either to Body

or Soul. This is Turning Religion into Superstition. " pag. 141. "

L. Sr, I have already answer'd your Lampoon upon *Consecrations* and *Dedications* (2. p. §. 3. and §. 17.) and you have so surfitted me with your nauseous Repetitions about our Making *Means of Grace*, that I am perfectly sick of it.

As to your noble Question, viz. *Whether supposing it were made Treason to draw the Picture of the King, or to bow to it, I would venture my Life upon all the Distinctions and Excuses, which are made for the Pictures of God?* I answer first, that your Question runs upon the Supposition, that *Christians* are forbid to make *Pictures of God*: which I have already proved to be false: Nay I have proved it from the *Practice* of your own Church, which makes *Pictures of God the Holy Ghost* in the *Likeness of a Dove*, as we of *God the Father* in the *Likeness of an Old Man*. And let me tell you, Sr, you will stand in Need of all our *Popish Distinctions*, and one more into the Bargain to bring yourself off. viz. that *Protestants* may lawfully do it, but not *Papists*.

I answer 2dly, that if any *King* should make it *Treason* to draw a *Picture* of him, or bow to it, I should conclude him to be *distracted*: And in that Case I should be as *Mad* as himself, if I ventured my *Life* in his Hands by Doing any Thing, that should put me under the Necessity of a *Distinction* to save it.

But you say, we venture our Souls upon a *Distinction* when we make *Pictures of God*, if it be a *Sin*. And do not you venture your Souls upon the same *Distinction*, when you make *Pictures of the Holy Ghost*, or even of *Christ*, if it be a *Sin*?

But pray, Sr, give me Leave to ask you whether you ever eat *blood-Puddings*?

G. Surely, My Lord, you are disposed to be merry.

L. No really, Sr, I am very serious. For whenever you eat *blood-Puddings*, you venture your *Soul* upon two *Distinctions*, if it be a *Sin*. Because *Eating Blood* is positively forbid by the *Law of God*. Here then you must *distinguish*, that it was forbid to the *Jews*, but not to *Christians*. But, Sr, it is likewise positively forbid to *Christians*. Act. 15. v. 29. And this *Prohibition* was never repeal'd by any *contrary Decree*. Here then you must venture your *Soul* upon a *second Distinction*: viz. that *Eating Blood* was forbid only for a *Time* whilst it was an *Occasion of Scandal* to the *converted Jews*. Thus, Sr, some Men have their *Consciences* like *Purses*, that may be either *shut* or *open'd* as *Occasion Serves*. When *Popery* is not the *Question* you can venture your *Soul* upon a *Distinction* as boldly as any *Man Living*; But when *Papists* are to be *traded*, your *Protestant Conscience* becomes so very *nice* and *Squeamish*, that a *Distinction* will not go down with you.

But I think we have now had enough of *Images*. So let us proceed to something else. It shall be *Transubstantiation*, if you please.

§. 22.

Of Transubstantiation.

“ G. MY Lord, *Transubstantiation* is a meer
 “ *School-nicety*, which no *Man* alive under-
 “ stands; and yet it is transform'd into an *Article*
 “ of *Faith* by the *Council of Trent*. pag. 141.

L. Sr, *Transubstantiation* is a *School-nicety* like *Consubstantiality*: yet this (according to your *Way of Speaking*) was transform'd into an *Article of Faith* by the first *Council of Nice*. And I believe *Transubstantiation* is full as intelligible as *Consubstantiality*. But if

the incomprehensibleness of a Mystery be an Objection against it, I know not what will become of the *three Creeds*.

G. Christ said, *this is my Body*; but as to the Manner or Means how it was so, he said not a Word. Whether only *Sacramentally*, *Figuratively* or *Symbolically*; or on the other Hand, *Substantially*, *Consubstantially*, or *Transubstantially*: These are Inventions of our own, from our poor *Philosophy*. And yet about these is our whole Dispute, which has tormented the *Christian Church* in our later Age more than all the other Mysteries of Religion. Had we kept to the Words of the Institution, as Christ left them, and gone no further, there might have been various Opinions in the Schools concerning the Manner of the Presence of Christ in the Sacrament; and they, who had Nothing else to do, might have spent their idle Hours, and vain Distinctions about it. But it had never broke the Communion of the Church, if it had not been adopted into an Article of Faith, and made a Condition of Communion. And now we must dispute about it. pag. 141. 142. "

L. What Pity is it, that the Church has made it her constant Practice to define Articles of Faith, as often as new Heresies were broach'd! For, if she had but let every one follow his own Fancy peaceably and quietly; if Truths opposite to new coin'd Heresies had never been adopted into Articles of Faith, the Communion of the Church had never been broke; but now they are made Conditions of Communion, we must dispute about them. This, Sr, has been the Language of Hereticks in all Ages, and the Arians declaim'd as bitterly against the great Council of Nice for Adopting Consubstantiality into an Article of Faith, and Making it a Condition of Communion, as Protestants declaim against the Councils of *Laseran* and *Trent* for

Adopting *Transubstantiation* into an *Article of Faith*.

But is it not very pleasant in you to complain how much the *Christian Church* has been tormented in this later Age with *Disputes* about this Matter? For pray, Sr, who were the first *Broachers* of these *Disputes*? Who were the *Agressors*? Was not the *Catholick Church*, when you separated yourselves from her, in as quiet and indisputable a Possession of the *Doctrine of Transubstantiation*, as of any other *Article of Religion*? Was there in the Beginning of the 16th Century a *Town or Village* in the whole *Christian World*, where it was not publicly taught and profess'd? Was it not defined against *Berengarius* (who likewise subscribed to it before his Death) in eleven *National or Provincial Councils* near upon 500 Years before the *Reformation*? Nay was not the very *Word* adopted by the *Lateran Council* above three hundred Years before *Luther* and *Calvin* set up for *Reformers*? If then the *Church* has been tormented with *Disputes* about it in this latter Age, the Blame lies at their Doors, who began these *Disputes*. They were the *Boutefeu's*, that broke the Peace, and not the *Papists*, who only adhered to the *ancient Doctrine*, they were in Possession of.

However since I perceive you lay your greatest Strefs upon the *Words of Christ's Institution*, *This is my Body*; and pretend that they do not determine, whether his *Body* be in the Sacrament *substantially* and *Transubstantially*, or only *figuratively*, or *Symbolically*: before I say any Thing concerning the perpetual Tradition of the Church relating to the Point in Question I shall first prove it from the very *Words of the Institution*, provided you will but allow, that *Christ* spoke *Truth*, and did not express himself *absurdly*. Which I think are two modest Requests.

§. 23.

Transubstantiation proved from the Words of Christ's Institution, *This is my Body, &c.*

G. **T**O proceed gradually, I shall first prove, that they import a *Substantial Presence* of Christ's Body; and after that there will be no great Need of Philosophy, but only of good common Sense to infer the Doctrine of Transubstantiation.

That they import a *substantial Presence* of Christ's Body I prove first. Because all Propositions like these, *this is Bread, this is a Man, this is the Tower, &c.* (unless you point to their Pictures) are in all common Discourse as currently understood for the *Reality* and *Substance* of the Things specified, as if the Words *really* and *Substantially* were added. Nay a Man would be laugh'd at for a formal cautious Coxcomb, if Pointing to a *Loaf of Bread* he should say, *this is Bread really and substantially*: or Coming from Court for Example, he should tell me he had seen the King that Day *really and substantially*. Because there is no Difference between a *Thing*, and it's *Reality* and *Substance*. In like Manner therefore when our Saviour said, *This is my Body*, he declared as effectually, that it was his *Body substantially*, or in *Substance*, as if he had express'd it in the most formal Terms. This is the common Language of Mankind. All Wise Men speak so, and all Wise Men understand it so; and if any Man should pretend to mean otherwise, he would deservedly pass for a notorious *Equivocator*, that says one Thing, and means another.

I prove it 2^{ly}, if Christ gave not his *real Body*, but a *Morsel of Bread* to his Apostles; when he said, *take and eat, This is my Body*, then it follows, that he

call'd a *Morsel of Bread* his *Body* ; which cannot be maintain'd without making Christ guilty of a downright *Absurdity*. For nothing can be more absurd, than to hold a *Morsel of Bread* in a Man's Hands, and point to it and say, *this is the living Body of a Man*: it being contrary to the common Practice of Mankind, and the common Laws of Speech to call one Thing by the Name of another, with which it has no Manner of *Resemblance* or *Connection*: and that too without giving the Persons, to whom it is spoken, the least Intimation to serve as a key to let them into the true Meaning of such an extraordinary and unheard of Manner of Speech. In Effect, it is much the same, as if I should write to you in Cyphers without ever giving you a key to understand me by.

I prove it 3^{ly}, a sober Man would be ashamed in any serious Occasion to use a *deceitful Way* of Speaking, so as to call a Thing by a Name it was never known by before. As for Example, to take up a Piece of Brick, and say *this is a Diamond*. 'Tis therefore incredible that Christ, who could say Nothing unbecoming himself, should use this *deceitful Way* of Speaking in the most *solemn Circumstance*, and *Action* of his Life: That is, when he was fulfilling the *Types* and *Figures* of the Ancient Law, declaring his last *Will* and *Testament*, and Instituting the most *Venerable Sacrament* of the New Law.

I prove it 4^{thly} from the Doctrine of your own Church: I mean not the *Writings* of some particular *English Protestants*, who teach the *Real*, and *Substantial* Presence of Christ in the *Sacrament* as we do, but your own *Church-Catechism*, which is printed in all your Books of *Common Prayer*, has the Authority of your whole Church to recommend it, and delivers the *Summary* of her Doctrine *Dogmatically*. Now in this Catechism to the Question, *what is the inward*
Part

Part or Thing signified? it is answer'd, *The Body and Blood of Christ, which are VERILY and INDEED taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.*

This, Sr, is the Doctrine of *your own Church*, of which I will not bate you a single Ace in this Dispute: For it expresses the *Real and Substantial Presence* of *Christ* in the *Eucharist* as fully as any of our Catechisms. Nay if *VERILY* and *INDEED* be not the same as *Really* and *Truly*, and of full Force to exclude a *meer Figurative Sense*, I confess I am yet wholly ignorant of the Signification even of the most ordinary Words, and it will be impossible to know what Men mean, even when they deliver themselves in the plainest Terms. So that you must either own, that according to the Doctrine of *your Church* the Words of *Christ's Institution* import a *Real and Substantial Presence* of his *Body and Blood* in the *Sacrament*; or you must suppose her guilty of a most *scandalous Equivocation* in so serious a Matter, and confess she only makes Use of the Words *VERILY* and *INDEED* to put a Cheat upon the People, and make *plain Bread and Wine* go down the better.

G. But, My Lord, what is all this to *Transubstantiation*? For, allowing the Words of the *Institution* to import a *real and Substantial Presence* of *Christ's Body and Blood* in the *Sacrament*, this neither determines them to *Transubstantiation* nor *Consubstantiation*, which therefore are meer Inventions of *Philosophy*, and no Articles of *Faith*.

L. Sr, if *Reasoning* from uncontested Principles of *Faith* be what you call *meer Inventions* of *Philosophy*, I will readily allow *Transubstantiation* to be an *Invention* of that Sort: For it follows by a *necessary Consequence* from the Supposition, that the Words of *Christ's Institution* are to be understood *literally*: That is, if they import a *Real and Substantial Pre-*

sence of his *Body* and *Blood*, as I have fully proved they do.

G. But why do's *Transubstantiation* follow any more than *Consubstantiation*?

L. Sr, if *Christ* taking the *Bread* into his Hands had said, *HERE is my Body*, then *Luther*, setting aside *Tradition*, would have had Reason on his side in saying that the *Bread* and *Body of Christ* are join'd together in the *Sacrament*. But *Christ* did not say, *HERE is my Body*, but *THIS is my Body*, which nothing but a *Substantial Change* can make really and literally true: For if what *Christ* gave to his *Apostles*, continued *Bread after*, as it was before the *Words of Consecration*, the Proposition was absolutely false; because the Sense of it then was, that the *Bread* he gave to the *Apostles* was his *Body*; which implies a Contradiction, and is as impossible, as that any two Substances remaining different should be the same.

It is not then *Philosophy*, as you pretend, but the plain *Text of Scripture*, which obliges us to believe *Transubstantiation*; that is, an entire Change of the Substances of *Bread* and *Wine* into the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*: As nothing but a *Substantial Change* could have made the *Words of Moses* true, if when he threw down his *Rod*, he had said, *this is a Serpent*; or of *Christ*, if he had said at *Cana in Galilee*, when the Servants brought in *Water*, *this is Wine*. For, if the *Water*, which the Servants brought, had remain'd in it's own *Nature*, and *Christ* had said to the Governor of the Feast, *This is Wine*, would he not have spoken a manifest Falsehood? In like Manner therefore the *Words of Consecration*, *This is my Body*, *this is my Blood*, could not be literally true, when *Christ* pronounced them, if the *Bread* and *Wine* had remain'd in their proper Substance.

Now, Sr, you may put what Objections you

please. But pray take Notice, that there is not an *Article* of the *Creed*, which a Man, if he pleases may not darken and perplex with *sophistical* Reasons against it.

G. The first Thing I have to say is, that it is very strange there should be any Dispute about it. For our Saviour was then fulfilling a *Type* of himself, which was the *Passover*, and he kept to the same *Phrase* or *Form of Words*, which was customary with the *Jews* in their Celebration of it, only Putting himself in the Room of his *Type*. As, instead of, *This is the Paschal Lamb, which was slain for us in Egypt*, he said, *this is my Body, which is given for you.*

And when *Moses* sprinkled the *Blood*, it was with this *Form of Words*, *this is the Blood of the Testament, which God has enjoined unto you.* Heb. 9. v. 20. Instead of which Old Testament *Christ* said, *This is my Blood of the New Testament.* Math. 26. v. 28. In which *Words* there is no Difficulty at all. For no Mortal ever understood these *Words* of *Moses* in a *Transubstantial* Sense; and why should they the same *Words*, when *Christ* spoke them following the very *Form* of the *Words* of *Moses*?

This made it familiar and easy to the *Apostles*, who call'd many Things *hard Sayings*, which were not so difficult as this; and yet express'd no Wonder or Astonishment at these *Words* of *Christ*; which had been impossible for them not to have done, if they had taken them in the Sense of *Transubstantiation*: for it was a new Thing never heard or thought of in the *World* to deny all their *Senses* at once. pag. 143. 144.

L. Sr, I find myself here assaulted with three Arguments tack'd together, and I shall answer them in the same Order, as they are proposed. First, you tell

me it was Customary with the Jews in the Celebration of the *Passover* to say, *this is the Paschal Lamb, which was slain for us in Egypt*. But, Sir, a Fact of this Nature ought not to come a *Begging*. Where is your Proof, that there was such a Custom amongst the Jews? But this it seems is wholly superseded, it being much easier to suppose, than prove it.

However let us suppose it was a Custom amongst the Jews to say at their *Passover*, *this is the Paschal Lamb, which was slain for us in Egypt*; this was as easy and familiar a *Metaphor*, as it would be in Visiting a Neighbour's Garden to say, *this Flower grows in my Garden*; meaning Flowers of the same Kind. But to make Christ call *Wine* his *Blood*, or a *Morsel of Bread* his *Body*, and that in the very *Institution* of a *Sacrament*, is such a Violent, improper, and unnatural *Figure*, as never was utter'd by any one in his right Senses. Christ could indeed, as he was the *Son of God*, change *Wine* into his *Blood*, with the same Ease as *Water* into *Wine*; but he could not speak *absurdly*, nor be guilty of an *Equivocation*, which any sober Man would be ashamed of. And therefore when he said, *This is my Blood*, he could mean nothing else, than that it was his *Blood* VERILY and INDEED, as your Catechism expresses it.

Your second Argument is a very strange one. I shall put it into some Form of Syllogism thus. [*Moses took REAL BLOOD, and said, this is the Blood of the Testament, &c. and Christ took WINE, and said, THIS IS MY BLOOD. But no Mortal ever understood the Words of Moses in a transubstantial Sense, therefore the Words of Christ are not to be understood in a Transubstantial Sense.*] Was there ever such wretched Stuff proposed in a serious Dispute! For the plain English of it this. BLOOD is call'd BLOOD without any Change; And why then should not WINE be call'd BLOOD

without any Change? A Man in the deepest Fit of the Spleen would scarce forbear Laughing at this Question. Yet it is the Ground of

Your *third* Argument, wherein you tell me, that the Words of Moses render'd those of Christ easy and familiar to the Apostles. This supposes, that the Apostles reflected at that Time upon the Words of Moses. But I take it to be much more rational to think the Apostles before the Coming of the Holy Ghost were too dull to make the nice Reflections and Discoveries you suppose they did. However had they done it, it would make against your Argument rather than for it. For what could be infer'd from their Interpreting the Words of our Saviour by those of Moses, but that as when Moses said, *this is Blood*, they understood *Blood* in the literal Sense, so they understood *Christ* in the very same Manner, when he said no less positively, *This is my Blood*? For as they could not doubt but that Moses spoke the Truth, and meant what he said, so it was the farthest from their Thoughts to Judge their Master guilty of a *shameful Equivocation* in so solemn an Occasion: and therefore nothing can be more absurd than to argue as you do, viz. that the Apostles imagined, that *Christ* call'd *Wine*, *Blood*, because *Moses* call'd *Blood*, *Blood*.

And why then should the Apostles ask any Questions about the Matter? the Apostles, Sr, believed every Thing Christ said with an *implicit Faith*, whether they comprehended it or not. The *Miracles*, they had seen him work, convinced them, that he could not only *change one Substance* into *another*, but likewise that the same *infinite Power*, which could make that *Change*, could hinder it from being perceived by their *Senses*. And therefore when *Christ* told them in the plainest Terms, that what he gave them to drink was his *Blood*, they had no *Bustles*.

consult their *Senses* for Information whether he spoke Truth or not; but took him at his Word, and believed they received his *Blood* VERILY and INDEED, as you are bound to do, if you believe your own Catechism.

As to what you say, *that the Apostles call'd many Things hard Sayings, which were not so difficult as this: Pray, Sr, where do you find this? Have you a Patent granted you to forge and coin Scriptural Facts as you please, because the Badness of your Cause stands in Need of it? Sr, I desire you to let me know in what Place of Scripture besides John. 6. v. 61, Christ's Words are call'd a hard Saying? But were they the Apostles that call'd them so? No, Sr, but only some of the Disciples, who thereupon separated themselves from our Saviour: who Turning to the twelve said, will ye also go away? v. 67. and Peter answer'd in the Name of all the rest; thou hast the Word of eternal Life, we believe, and are sure, that thou art Christ the Son of the Living God. v. 68. 69. Which was far from Calling his Words a hard Saying: tho Christ at that very Time promised to leave them his Flesh to eat, and Blood to drink. And so it is no Wonder, that they made no Replies, nor express'd any Astonishment, when he perform'd that Promise at his last Supper.*

ADVERTISEMENT.

TIs very plain that the three foregoing *Sections* contain several Objections proposed by the *Gentleman*, which ought not to be pass'd over without an Answer. Yet, as the *Gentleman* has managed the former *Conversation* betwixt his *Lordship* and himself, his peaceable Antagonist lets him run on there

for five whole Pages without Answering one single Word in Defense of his Cause. I presume the *Gentleman* imagined his *Protestant* Readers would interpret his *Lordship's* Silence for a tacit Acknowledgment that *Papists* have nothing to answer to any of the various Objections contain'd in those five Pages. But I hope I have now disabused them in the three foregoing *Sections*; wherein those five uninterrupted Pages are now parcell'd out into several Heads with their proper Answers to them.

However his *Lordship* being at length allow'd to break Silence blunders out the following Piece of Nonsense in Answer to the *Gentleman's* two last Lines concerning the *Denying our Senses*. *L. I wonder you should stand so much upon this. You object your Senses and your Reason: and yet you give them both up in the Mystery of the Trinity, Incarnation, &c.* This, I say, is rank Nonsense. *First*, because our *Senses* have nothing to do particularly with the Mystery of the *blessed Trinity*, and therefore 'tis talking like a Ninny to say they must be given up in that Mystery. And *2dly*, as to the giving up our *Reason*, 'tis false to say we give it up in any Mystery whatsoever. For if we did, *Faith* and *Religion* would be against *Reason*; which I take to be little better than Blasphemy. 'Tis true we submit our *Reason* in Mysteries that are above it: but Submitting in this Case is not giving up our *Reason*, but acting according to it: because nothing is more reasonable, than that we should submit ourselves to *Divine Revelation* in Mysteries surpassing all human Reason, as

has been fully explain'd. [1. Part. §. 51.] All this the *Gentleman* knew very well, as appears from his Answer to the abovesaid Piece of Nonsense [*Case stated*, pag. 143.] which being the same in Substance as what I have now given to it, needs not be repeated here. But the Words he concludes with relating to the *Senses*, together with his *Lordship's* two Repartees, in which he even outdo's himself in Nonsense, deserve to be set down.

G. *But for the other Point, viz. that of Contradicting my outward Senses, I think is an unanswerable Objection.*

L. *Why? must you not give them up as to the Trinity and Incarnation?*

G. *Not at all, My Lord. They contradict none of my Senses. Pray tell me, which of them do they contradict? Is it the Sense of Hearing, Seeing; or Smelling?*

L. *They are not the Object of Sense.*

G. *Therefore they contradict them not.*

This is really Overstraining the Character of a Dunce in the Person of our noble Peer, and Exposing him too unmercifully. For to make him first tell the *Gentleman* that he must give up his *Senses* as to the *Trinity* and *Incarnation*, and then own in the same Breath that those two Mysteries are not the *Object of Sense*, is something so eminently absurd, that nothing but a Driveler can be capable of it.

But let us now hear what the *Gentleman* has to say concerning the Contradiction of our *Senses* in *Transubstantiation*.

§. 24.

Neither Reason nor Religion obliges us to Judge always according to the Information of our Senses.

6. **M**Y Lord, all our *Senses* are contradicted in *Transubstantiation*. And I stand upon it, that since the Creation of the *World*, God never did nor said any Thing, which contradicted the *Sense* of any Man. It would be Destroying the Certainty of every Thing. *Miracles* are *Appeals* to our *Senses*, and without Believing our *Senses* we can trust to no *Miracles*, and by Consequence to no *Revelation*. pag. 144. "

L. You tell me, you stand upon it, that since the Creation of the *World* God never did, nor said any Thing, which contradicted the *Sense* of any Man. 'Tis very stoutly said indeed. But let us see, whether you can stand your Ground.

Pray, Sr, how long was it before the Creation of the *World* that an *Angel* appear'd to *Joshua* in the Shape of a Man? *Jos. 5. v. 13. 14.* That *God the Father* appear'd to *Daniel* in the Likeness of an *Old Man*? *Dan. 7. v. 9.* That the *Holy Ghost* appear'd over our *Saviour's* Head in the Likeness of a *Dove*? *Math. 3. v. 16.* And, to omit many other Instances, that two *Angels* appear'd to the *Women* at the *Sepulchre* in the Likeness of two *Men*? *Luke 24. v. 4.* For I stand positively upon it that in all these *Scriptural* Facts the *Senses* were contradicted in the same Manner as they are in *Transubstantiation*. Could *Joshua* discern by the Ministry of any of his *Senses*, that it was not a *Man*, but an *Angel* whom he saw with a *Sword* drawn in his *Hand*, and whose *Voice* he heard Commanding him to put off his *Shoes*, because the

Ground whereon he stood was *Holy*? And so proportionably of the rest.

But, Sr, are not your *Senses* also *contradicted* as often as you receive the *Body of Christ* VERILY and INDEED? Do your *Eyes* see it? Your *Hands* feel it? Or your *Palate* tast it? No surely. And yet you receive it VERILY and INDEED, that is, *truly*, and *really*, if you believe your *Church-Catechism*. And is it not then Talking meer unintelligible Riddles to say, *God never did any Thing, which contradicted the Sense of any Man*? Nay and to stand upon it with a Positiveness; which must Surprize all Men of common Sense? Had you not much better own *Transubstantiation* honestly and Fairly, than to play and trifle in this Manner with Words even in *sacred Matters*?

But you tell me, *it would be Destroying the Certainty of every Thing*. That is to say, if Things ever appear otherwise to our *Eyes* than they are in themselves, we must never trust them any more. Pray, Sr, take Care then never to look at the *Sun*, or *Moon*, or *Stars*. For they all appear to your *Eyes* much lesser than they are in themselves. But *Reason* corrects the *Misinformation* of our *Senses*; and so it do's, when *Revelation* tells us, that the Thing, which appears to be *Bread*, is the *Body of Christ* VERILY and INDEED.

Lastly, you tell me, *that Miracles are Appeals to our Senses, and without Believing our Senses we can trust to no Miracles, and consequently to no Revelation*. The true Meaning hereof is, that unless in all Occasions whatsoever we Judge according to the *Information of our Senses*, no Man can rationally believe he ever saw a *Miracle*. Now let us examine the Truth of this Assertion from the Circumstances of a Fact, which every Body is acquainted with.

St Peter was imprison'd in *Jerusalem*; and the very

Night before he was to be deliver'd up to the People, an *Angel* came to him as he laid asleep bound with two Chains, and *smiting him on the Side* raised him up, and bad him follow him. Whereupon his *Chains* felt off from his Hands, and when they came to the Iron-Gate, which led to the City, it open'd of it's own Accord. But as soon as they came together to the End of the first Street, the *Angel* disappear'd: and then it was that St *Peter* knew for certain that God had sent an *Angel* to deliver him. *Act. 12.*

Here then is a Fact, wherein St *Peter* both believed, and disbelieved the Information of his Senses. For it is certain, that no Sensation either of Seeing, Hearing, or Feeling could inform him that it was an *Angel*, whom God had sent for his Deliverance. On the contrary, had he judg'd according to the Information of any of his Senses, he must have fallen into an Error, in Believing that he felt, heard, and saw a *Man*. Yet at the same Time he believed his Eyes, and had nothing but his Eyes to trust to in Believing that he saw two Miracles wrought in favour of him, viz. the Falling off of his Chains, and the Iron-Gate's Opening of its own Accord. Now we do not find St *Peter* argued, as you do, viz. that without Believing his Senses in all Things, he could believe no Miracles. Neither do we find him Arguing thus. *My senses misinform'd me, when I seem'd to myself to see, hear, and feel a Man; therefore I must not believe any of the innumerable Miracles I have seen Christ Work with my own Eyes, nor by Consequence believe any Revelation.* 'Tis therefore false, nay blasphemous what you say, viz. that without Believing our Senses (in every Thing) we can trust to no Miracles, nor by Consequence to any Revelation; especially when Revelation itself obliges us not to Judge according to the Information of our Senses.

» G. It is a needless Supposition, for there is no
» such *Revelation*. pag. 144.

L. No, Sr! You must have a good Stock of Assurance to say so after the many *Scriptural* Instances I have produced to the contrary. Had not St *Peter* a *Revelation*, that it was an *Angel*, who appear'd to him, when *all his Senses* inform'd him, that it was a *Man*?

» G. But if there were a *Revelation*; if an *Angel*
» should appear to me, and bid me believe that I
» saw him, but not to believe any Thing else that
» I saw of a hundred Things round about him, I
» should without more ado either believe that I saw
» the other Things I did see; or if I must not be-
» lieve I saw *them*, I should not believe I saw *him*.
» pag. 144.

L. Sr, if I should hear an *Angel* talk the *Nonsense* you suppose him to talk to you, I would not believe him. For one absurd Supposition do's many Times infer another. As, if I suppose you to be a *Horse*, I may legally infer, you are no *Protestant* *Divine*. But if *God* should *reveal* to me by an *Angel*, that what to my *Eyes* and *Ears* appears to be a *Man*, is *not a Man*, I should certainly believe the *Revelation* of *God* in flat *Contradiction* to the Information of my *Senses*. Nor should this hinder me from Believing my *Eyes* as to all other visible Objects about me.

» G. My Lord, I take it for a *certain Rule*, that
» we must either believe our *Senses* in *every Thing*,
» or in *Nothing*. pag. 144.

L. Now, Sr, you speak out boldly, and like a true *Protestant* Hero. But, if this be true, it follows *first*, that they, who at our Saviour's Baptism saw the *Likeness* of a *Dove* over his Head, were bound to believe it was a *real Dove*, and not the *Holy Ghost*:

And so the *Evangelists* are made the Authors of a Falsehood. It follows 2dly, that the *Women* at the *Sepulchre* acted absurdly in Believing that they saw two *Angels*. Yet they believed it firmly, and told the *Disciples* they had seen a *Visison of Angels*. Luke 24. v. 23. It follows 3dly from your Rule that St *Peter* was grossly mistaken, when he said, *Now I know for certain, that God has sent his Angel, and hath deliver'd me out of the Hands of Herod*. Act. 12. v. 11. Lastly, it follows from your certain Rule, that tho *God* should at any Time tell me, that my *Eyes* misinform me, I am bound either not to believe him, or renounce the Use of my Senses for ever: Which if it be not *Blasphemy* or *Madness*, I desire to know what is.

G. Had not the *Apostles* at the *Lord's Supper* as much Reason to doubt, whether it was *Christ* they saw, or that he spoke to them, as that it was *Bread*, which they saw and eat? pag. 144. "

L. No, Sr, they had not; and the Reason is plain. Because *Christ* did not tell them, that they saw him not, or heard him not. But he told them positively, that it was his *Body*, which he gave them to eat. The *Apostles* therefore had no Reason to doubt of the Reality of his *Body*; nor could they believe it was *Bread*, because a *Morsel of Beard* is no more a *Living Body*, than your *Head* is a *Barber's Pole*. Nay you yourself, if you will stand to the Doctrine of your own Church, are bound to believe, that he gave them his *Body* VERILY and INDEED. And, if he gave them his *Body* VERILY and INDEED, how could it be Nothing but *Bread*, which they saw and eat? Or was it verily and indeed both *Bread*, and his *Body*?

G. My Lord, if you come once to *deceptio Visus*, it will go quite through, and you cannot be sure of one Thing more than another: because the Fault is in the *Eye*, not in the *Object*. So that if *Transub-*

» *stantiation* be true, there is nothing else in the
 » *World* true but it. pag. 144. 145.

L. Sr, the *Truth* of *Transubstantiation* hinders no more the *Truth* of other *Things* perceptible by our *Senses*, than the *Truth* of any *Mystery*, that is *above* our *Reason*, hinders the *Truth* of *Things*, that are *within* the *Reach* of it. Neither is there any *Fault* either in the *Eye*, or in the *Object*, but the *Fault* is in the *Heart* and *Understanding*, if it presumes to question the *Divine Veracity*, and contrary to the infallible *Revelation* of *God* believes that to be *Bread*, which he declares to be his *Body*.

» G. My Lord, *Transubstantiation* is no small Pre-
 » judice to this *Miracle* of *Miracles*, and a Contra-
 » diction to itself, and to all other *Miracles*, and to
 » every *Thing* else in the *World*; that it should be
 » put upon us just for Nothing but to stagger our
 » Faith, and make us doubt of every *Thing*! p. 145.

L. Sr, *Transubstantiation* is a *Mystery*, which like the *Incarnation* exercises my *Faith*, but staggers it not, nor makes me doubt of any one *Truth* I know of. Nay, on the contrary, they, who deny it, may with the same *Obstinacy* deny the *Incarnation*, with which of all *Mysteries* it has the greatest *Resemblance*; and which is both lampoon'd, and as strongly disputed against by *Jews* and *Socinians*, as *Transubstantiation* is by you.

But it is above my *Understanding* to comprehend your *Saying*, that it is a *Contradiction* to itself, and to all other *Miracles*, and to every *Thing* else in the *World*; unless your *Meaning* be, that I must utterly renounce the *Use* of all my *Senses*, if either *Reason* or *Revelation* assures me, that in some *Cases* *Things* are not what they appear to be. The *Absurdity* whereof I have already sufficiently exposed.

However I am glad to hear you call the *Sacrament*

of the *Lord's Supper* the *Miracle of Miracles*. And indeed it is but Speaking consonantly to the Doctrine of your own Church teaching that the *Body and Blood of Christ* are received VERILY and INDEED in the *Lord's Supper*: For this is truly the *Miracle of Miracles*. But if in Taking it we receive nothing but plain Bread and Wine, tis not only rank Nonsense to call it so, but a notorious Cheat put upon the People, who will imagine great Miracles and Wonders are wrought, when every Thing remains in it's proper and natural Being.

G. My Lord, if all the Benefits of the Death of Christ be convey'd to us in the *Sacrament* by a figurative and Symbolical Representation of his Body and Blood, and that it be so instituted for this End, it is to all intents and Purposes as Beneficial to us, as if we had eat the *Flesh of Christ* off his Bones, or drank the very Blood that came out of his Side, which is abhorrent to think; and to avoid which you call this an *unbloody Sacrifice*. But how is it unbloody, if it be real Blood, even the selfsame Blood, that was shed upon the *Cross*? pag. 145. "

L. And would you not have the People believe it to be real Blood, when you tell them, that the *Body and Blood of Christ* are received VERILY and INDEED in the *Lord's Supper*? And if it be *Christ's Blood* VERILY and INDEED, can it be any other Blood as to it's Substance, than what he shed upon the *Cross*? Yet I presume your Communicants do not take it in a Bloody Manner. But why then is it call'd an *Unbloody Sacrifice*? Because *Christ* the *Victim* is not Kill'd upon the Altar, as he was upon the *Cross*.

As to what you say, that all the Benefits of the Death of Christ may be convey'd to us by a figurative and Symbolical Presence, I answer, the Question is not, what Christ might have done, but what he has effectually

done for us. He might have redeem'd us without *Dying* on the *Croß*, but must we infer from thence, that he has not *died* for us on the *Croß*? In like Manner therefore, tho all the Benefits of his Death and Passion might have been convey'd to us by our Receiving a *Morsel* of *common Bread*, or any other *Way*, or without any Sacraments at all, if he had been pleased to ordain it so, do's it therefore follow that he has effectually ordain'd it so? On the contrary his infinite Goodness has thought fit to communicate his own sacred *Body* and *Blood Really* and *truly* to us; that is, not *figuratively* or *Symbolically* only, but *VERILY* and *INDEED*; for I cannot express it in stronger Terms.

§. 25.

Christ's Body and Blood are both really and spiritually present in the Sacrament.

G. **M**Y Lord, you yourselves allow, that his Words must be taken in a *Spiritual*, not a *Carnal* Sense, because *Christ* himself said speaking of this *Sacrament* (as you own) and to solve that *hard Saying*, at which many were offended, of Giving them his *Flesh* to eat, he made it easy to them by this Explication; *It is the Spirit that quickneth, the Flesh profiteth Nothing. The Words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit, and they are Life.* Joh. 6. v. 65. May we not then take his Words in a *spiritual* Sense? pag. 145.

L. Yes Sr, we may; provided the *Reality* of *Christ's Presence* in the *Sacrament* be not excluded by it. That is to say, provided it be consistent with our Receiving his *Body* and *Blood VERILY* and *INDEED*. Now the Words, you have quoted from *St John*, insinuate such

such a *Spiritual Sense*, as is neither inconsistent with the *Literal Meaning* of the *Institution*, nor the *Reality* of *Christ's Presence* in the *Sacrament*: but is only opposed to the *Carnal Sense* of those incredulous Disciples, who according to their gross *Imagination* knew of no other *Eating* or *Drinking* than for the *Nourishment* of their *Bodies*; and (to speak in *St Austin's* own Words) *thought our Saviour intended to cut off Pieces of his own Flesh from his Body for them to eat, and therefore said, this is a hard Saying.* Aug. in Psal. 98.

Now, to correct this gross Mistake, *Christ* said, *it is the Spirit that quickneth, the Flesh profiteth Nothing.* As who should say, it is not *Dead corruptible Flesh*, and *Changeable* into the Substance of your Bodies, that profits in Order to *Salvation*: But the *Flesh*, I intend to give you for the *Nourishment* of your Souls, has all it's saving Qualities from the *Spirit* or *Divinity*, by which it is *quickned*.

This is exactly conformable to *St Austin's* Comment upon those Words. *What then* (says he) *is the Meaning of this, the Flesh profits Nothing? As they understood it, as it is torn in Pieces in a Dead Body, and sold in the Shambles, it profits Nothing: But it profits as animated by the Spirit ---- For if the Flesh profited Nothing, the Word would not have been made Flesh, that it might dwell in us.*

Thus *St Austin*. And who would not now be surpriz'd to find most *Protestant* Authors as well as yourself lay such a Stress upon this Text, as even to make it the principal Support of their Error? But ignorant People must be imposed upon by some scriptural Text; and this being obscure in itself was fittest for that purpose; tho, if rightly understood, it cannot furnish you with the least Shadow of an Argument against the *real Presence* of *Christ's Body* and *Blood* in

the Sacrament. *Christ* says, *it is the Spirit that quickneth, the Flesh profiteth Nothing.* That is (according to *St Austin*) *Dead Flesh, as cut and sold in the Shambles, profits Nothing, but it profits as animated by the Spirit:* And is it not Playing at Cross Purposes to infer from thence, that therefore *Christ's Living Body* is not received *really and truly* in the Sacrament?

G. My Lord, the *Body of Christ* is taken and received in the same Manner as it is present in the Sacrament: and you yourselves allow, that it is there present in a *Spiritual* not *Carnal* Manner.

L. Sir, it is certainly true, that the *Body of Christ* is received in the same Manner as it is present in the Sacrament: And therefore as it is received *VERILY and INDEED*; that is, *Really and truly*, and without *Equivocation*; so it is *VERILY and INDEED*, that is *really and truly*, and without *Equivocation* present in the Blessed Sacrament. But *Real* and *Carnal* are not the same. And therefore, tho the *Body of Christ* be *really and truly* present in the Sacrament, the *Manner* of it's Presence is *Spiritual*; not as *Spiritual* is opposite to *Real*, but as it is opposite to *Carnal*. That is, as it is opposite to that *gross Idea* or Notion, which the Unbelieving Disciples had of the Meaning of our Saviour's Words. For they imagined he was to be cut in Pieces, and that they were to eat *his Flesh*, as that of common Animals, for the Nourishment of their Bodies.

Christ's Body therefore is not present in this *Carnal* Manner; yet it is *really and truly* present in the Sacrament as to it's *Substance*, tho the *Manner* of it's Presence be *Spiritual*.

First, as to it's Condition, or Endowments: I mean, it's being *Glorious, impassible, incorruptible, immortal.* There is a *Natural Body*, and there is a *Spiritual Body*. It is sown a *Natural Body*, and it is raised a *Spiritual Body*. 1. Cor. 15.

2dly, as to the Manner of it's being in *Place*; which is not according to the usual Laws of Bodies commensurated to, or circumscribed by *Place*, but more Resembling the Idea we have of *Spirits*. Thus, when *Christ* came to his Disciples, *the Doors being shut*, his Entrance was *Spiritual*, tho *Real*.

3dly, it is *spiritual* as to the *End*, for which it is received, viz. the Nourishment of our Souls.

4thly, as to the *Persons*, by whom it is received. For the *unworthy Communicant* receives it with his *Mouth* only; and therefore *the Flesh profits him Nothing*; but it is *Spirit* and *Life* to the *worthy Communicant*; because he receives it *Spiritually* as well as *truly* and *really*.

5thly, and lastly it's *Manner* is *spiritual* as to our *Sensation*, because we have not from our *Senses* any Information of it's *Presence*, but only from our *Faith*.

Thus then the Manner of it's *Presence* is *Spiritual*: But 'tis a *Spirituality* no ways opposite to it's *Reality*. And therefore your Argument is of no Force to prove against us, that we allow of a meer *Figurative*, or *Symbolical* Presence.

G. My Lord, there is not one Man in your *Communion*, but must own that the *Words* of *Institution* are *Figurative*. For Example, *This Cup is the new Testament in my Blood, which is shed for you.* Luke 22. v. 20. Here is first the *Cup* for the *Wine* by a *Metonymie* call'd *continens pro contento*. Then the *Cup* being the *new Testament*, I suppose you will allow is another *Figure*. And 'tis an other, *it is shed for which shall be shed*; for his *Blood* was not then *shed*. This last *Figure* you have boldly avoided in your *Maß*, where it is put *effundetur*, shall be shed instead of *effunditur*, or *effusum* according to the Greek ἐκχυνόμενον. However the two other *Figures* stand unalterable. pag. 146. "

L. Pray, Sr, what *Figure* is there in these *Words* of St *Mathew*, *This is my Body*; *This is the Blood of the new Testament*, which shall be shed for *Many* for the *Remission of Sins*. C. 26. v. 26. 28. I presume you will not deny these to be the *Words* of the *Institution*. And if St *Luke* has made *Choice* of *Figures* to express the same Thing; must *Figures* expound plain *Words*, or plain *Words* the *Figures*?

However that be, I cannot but pity the hard Shifts you are put to, in being forced to make this an Argument of importance, viz. *Amongst the Words of the Institution as deliver'd by St Luke, there are some Figures; therefore the whole Institution is to be understood in a Figurative, or Symbolical Sense*. Suppose a Master should speak thus to his Servant, *This Bottle is not good, bring me a better Bottle of the same Wine*; Here is the very *Metonymie* you speak of: Yet I believe the Servant would not be such a Blockhead as to think his Master demanded a Bottle of *Figurative* or *Symbolical Wine*. In like Manner therefore, when St *Luke* uses the aforesaid *Metonymie* in thus Delivering the *Words* of the *Institution*, *this Cup is the new Testament in my Blood*, tho *Cup* and *Testament* be *Figures*, a Man must be either very *Weak* or very *perverse* to conclude, the *Evangelist* means *Figurative* or *Symbolical Blood*; and if he do's not, what Matter is it, whether *Cup* and *Testament* be *Figures* or not?

If *Christ* had said, *this Cup is the new Testament in Wine*, would the *Metonymie* have hinder'd you from taking the *Word Wine* in it's *Literal Sense*? And why then should it hinder you from taking the *Word Blood* in it's *Literal Sense*, when he says, *this Cup is the New Testament in my Blood*? You may as well say, that if there be some *Metaphors* in any Sentence, as thus, *the Furnace of Tribulation, and the Rod of Reproof make Men Wise*, every *Word* in that

Sentence must be understood *Metaphorically*; which would turn all such *Ways of Speaking* into rank Nonsense; tho they be used even in the most familiar Discourses. And the Reason is, because all *Figures* of this Nature are so easy and familiar, that no Man of common Sense can misunderstand them, and the foremention'd *Words* of St *Luke* are as plain to all but profess'd Triflers, as these *Words* of St *Mathew*, *This is the Blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many for the Remission of Sins.* But to call *Bread* a *Living Body*, or *Wine Blood*, that is, to give Things Names, they were never known by in the *World*; and that in the *very Institution* of a *Sacrament*, and without any previous or concomitant Intimation of their Meaning, is such an *absurd, unnatural*, and *Equivocating Way of Speaking*, that we cannot without Impiety Judge *Christ* capable of it.

As to the third pretended *Figure*, which you say we have boldly avoided in the *Maß*, Sr, I either have a Pair of very bad Spectacles, or the *Latin Version* has effundetur in St *Mathew* 26. v. 28. and fundetur, that is, shall be shed in St *Luke* 22. v. 20. And so the *Maß* being in *Latin*, and many hundred Years older, than the *English Protestant Bible*, has boldly follow'd the *Latin Version*, which had the Approbation of the *Catholick Church* many Ages before *Reforming* came into Fashion.

G. My Lord, to convince you, that the *Words* of *Christ* are *Figurative*, and that the *Elements* do not lose their Nature by the *Consecration*, they are call'd by their own Names after the *Consecration*, as *Wine* is call'd the *Fruit of the Vine* after the *Consecration*. Math. 26. v. 29. Mark 14. v. 25. And it is call'd *Bread*, which they eat in the *Sacrament*, and we are call'd *Bread*, because we partake of that *Bread*, 1. Cor. 10. v. 17. 1. Cor. 11. v. 26. 27. 28. We are

» *Bread by the same Figure*, that *Bread is Flesh*: And
 » we are no more sure, that we are not *Bread*, than
 » that the *Sacrament* is not *Bread*. pag. 146.

L. Pray, Sr, forget not your *Catechism*, but vouchsafe to remember, that the *Body of Christ* is received *Verily* and *indeed* in the *Lord's Supper*. This therefore we are *sure* of. But I hope we are not *equally sure*, that either you or I came out of a Meal-tub, or were baked in a Oven *VERILY* and *INDEED*. I shall answer your *Texts* immediately.

» G. But see now the *Arbitrariness* of your Interpretation. When it is said of *Bread*, *this is Flesh*, that is so very plain, it must be taken *literally*: » But when it is said of *Bread* in the *Sacrament*, *this is Bread*, the Expression is so obscure, that it must » be taken *Figuratively*. Is not this Destroying the » Meaning of all Expressions to take *Words Figuratively* or *Literally* Just as you think fit, and contrary to the common Usage, as understood in all » other Things? » pag. 147.

L. Sr, to take *Words Figuratively* or *Literally* just as a Man thinks fit is certainly *Destroying the Meaning of all Expressions*, and if you will but stand to this one Principle, there is an End of the Dispute between you and me concerning *Transubstantiation*. For then you will find yourself obliged to understand the *Words* of the Institution *Literally*; since they cannot possibly be otherwise understood but by the most *strain'd* and *Arbitrary* Interpretation; as I have clearly proved. Nay your own Church understands them so by Declaring, that the *Body and Blood of Christ* are *VERILY* and *INDEED* taken and received by the *Faithful* in the *Lord's Supper*; to which *Words* you can give no *Figurative* Sense without the most *Arbitrary* Interpretation in the *World*: And if *Christ's Body and Blood* are received *Verily* and *indeed*.

§. 25. *and spiritually present, &c.* 151
in the *Sacrament*, there must be either a *Substantial Change* of the *Bread* and *Wine* into the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*; or they must be join'd together; as *Luther* holds.

But, as an *Arbitrary Way* of taking *Words Figuratively* destroys the *Meaning* of all *Expressions*, so it is no less destructive to the *Common Laws* of *Speech* to conclude from thence, that therefore *Figures* which are *easy* and *Natural*, and taken for such by the *Generality* of *Mankind*, are likewise *Arbitrary*. Because it is morally impossible either to write or speak without the *Use* of *such Figures*; and they are so far from *Obscuring*, that they give the greatest *Beauty*, *Strength*, and *Lustre* to any *Sort* of *Discourse*. Now then let us consider, whether *Calling* the *Elements* by their *own Names* after the *Consecration* be not *Figures* of this *Sort*, or whether there be any *Arbitrariness* in the *Use* of them.

I prove there is no *Arbitrariness* in it, because it is the *common Custom* of *Mankind* to give a *Thing* the *Name* of that, out of which it is made. Thus it was said to *Adam* Gen. 3. v. 19. *Dust thou art*; because tho then a *Living Man* he had been made of *Dust*. Thus the *Person's Name* is given to his *Corps*; as *Joseph* desires *Leave* to bury his *FATHER*. Gen. 50. v. 5. And, *behold there was a DEAD MAN carried out, the ONLY SON of his Mother*. Luke 7. v. 12. The *Serpent* was made by a *substantial Change* from *Aaron's Rod*, which even lost it's former *Appearance*, yet is still call'd a *Rod*, because made from it. *They cast down every Man his Rod, and they became Serpents*; But *AA-RON'S ROD* swallow'd up *their Rods*. Exod. 7. v. 12.

Thus it is plain we are not guilty of *Arbitrariness* either in taking the *Words* of the *Institution* literally, or the *Words Bread* and *Wine* after the *Consecration* in a *Figurative Sense*. Nay Nothing but one ob-

stinately resolved to be in the Wrong can understand either of them in any other Sense.

G. My Lord, we are call'd *Bread* 1. Cor. 10. v. 17. And we are call'd *Bread* by the same *Figure*, that *Bread is Flesh*.

L. Sr, both these Propositions, *we are Bread*, and *Bread is Flesh* are literally false. And if *Christ* had said, *this Bread is my Body*, the Expression would have been *Figurative*. Because it is equally Nonsense to say that *Bread* is a *living Body* literally, as it is to say, that, *we are Bread* literally. But *Christ* did not say, *this Bread is my Body*, but only, *this is my Body*: which, according to the common Way of Speaking, signified no more, than that the *Thing present*, which he gave to his Apostles, was his *real Body*.

§. 26.

Objections from the Fathers answer'd.

G. **M**Y Lord, every one abounds in his own Sense, But I appeal to that of the *Ancient Fathers*.

L. With all my Heart, Sr.

T E R T U L L I A N.

„ G. *Tertullian* says, that *Christ* made the *Bread* his
 „ *Body*, by Saying, *this is my Body*, that is, the *Fi-*
 „ *gure of my Body*. *Contra Marcion*. Lib. 4. C. 40.
 „ pag. 147.

L. Sr, *Tertullian's* true Meaning is, that *Christ* made the *Bread* (which before was but a *Figure* of his *Body*) become his *real Body* by Saying, *this is my Body*. The Institution therefore did not make it a *Figure*, but changed it into the *Reality*, whereof it was

was a Figure before. Now that this is the true Meaning of his Words I prove from the very Subject of his Dispute with *Marcion*, who held that our Saviour came to *destroy* the Law : but *Tertullian* proves, he came to *perfect* it by Fulfilling the *Prophecies* and *Figures* ; and brings this Instance , that *Christ changed Bread* (which in the old Law was a Figure of his Body) into his Body. Which is a plain Proof, that these latter Words of the Passage quoted [*that is, the Figure of my Body*] are *transplac'd*, and cannot be referr'd to any Thing but the *Bread*.

G. But, My Lord, the *Transposition* you speak of, is but an odd Sort of *Figure* ; and by the Help of it you may do wonderful Feats, and make the *Fathers* say what you please.

L. Sr , I don't pretend to commend *Tertullian's* Style , or propose his Writings as the Standard of good Latin. But *Fact* is *Fact*, and 'tis an undeniable one, that *Tertullian* frequently made Use of that *Figure* out of Respect to the Word of God , which he would not interrupt by Interposing his own Words. This made him say *Lib. contra Prax. C. 29. Christus mortuus est, id est, unctus* ; *Christ is Dead, that is anointed* ; instead of Saying, *Christ, that is the anointed, is Dead*. And in the very Book against *Marcion*, C. 2. he writes thus, *aperiam in Parabolam aurem meam, id est Similitudinem. I will open to a Parable my Ear, that is, a Similitude*. Where his Meaning is undoubtedly this, *I will open to a Parable, that is ; to a Similitude my Ear*. So that let the *Transposition* be as odd a *Figure* as you please, tis manifest *Tertullian* has frequently made Use of it ; Nor can you explain him otherwise without making him talk wide from the Purpose.

O R I G E N.

G. Origen says of the *Sacrament* , that it go's into
II. Part. V

» the Belly like other Meat, and so into the Draught.
 » But says, he speaks concerning the *Typical* and
 » *Symbolical* Body of *Christ* in the *Sacrament*. in Math.
 » C. 15.

» It was said of the *Body of Christ*, Psal. 16. v. 10.
 » that it should not see *Corruption*. But we know the
 » *Sacrament* will corrupt; therefore it is not the same.
 » pag. 147.

L. Sr, when I was a Young Schollar, I remember I answer'd this Argument by Distinguishing, that the *outward Part* of the *Sacrament*, viz. the *Accidents of Bread and Wine* will corrupt, but not the *inward Part*, which is *Verily and Indeed the Body and Blood of Christ*. And, tho I know you to be an Enemy to *Popish* Distinctions, I must desire you to accept of this for your Answer.

As to *Origen*, you have clipp'd his Words, and conceal'd that Part, which fully explains his Meaning. I presume your Reason for so Doing is, because the Words, you have omitted, imply the very *Distinction* I have now given. For his genuine Words are these, *This Food consecrated by the Word of God and Prayer, AS TO THE MATERIAL PART OF IT, go's into the Belly, and so into the Draught*, This shews that *Origen* speaks not of the *Sacrament* absolutely, but with this Limitation, *as to the material Part* of it; meaning the *Accidents of Bread and Wine*: which he calls the *Typical* and *Symbolical* Body; because the *Accidents of Bread and Wine* are a *Sign, Type, or Symbol* of *Christ's Body* nourishing our Souls.

T H E O D O R E T.

» *G. Theodoret* likewise calls the *Sacrament* the
 » *Symbols of the Body and Blood of Christ*; and says

§. 26. *Objections from the Fathers.* 155
that upon their Consecration they are *changed in-* “
deed, and made other Things, but still remain in “
their own proper *nature* and *substance*, and *Shape* “
and *Form*: and are *visible* and *tangible* as they were “
before. *Dial.* 2. pag. 147. 148. “

L. Sr, as to the first Part of your Quotation, *Theodore* never calls the Sacrament *meer Symbols* of the *Body and Blood of Christ*: and if he do's not call it so, he says nothing to serve your Turn. Do not we also call it the *Sacrament* of the *Body and Blood of Christ*? And what is a *Sacrament* but a *Sign* or *Symbol*? But I hope you will not conclude from thence, that therefore we believe it to be a meer empty *Sign* or *Figure* of *Christ's Body and Blood*.

The latter broken Piece, as you have quoted it, is wholly unintelligible. I shall therefore cite the whole Passage, which is taken out of *Theodore's* second Dialogue; where under the Name of *Orthodoxus* he maintains the Catholick Cause against an *Eutychian*, whom he calls *Eranistes*. His Words faithfully translated are as follows.

ERANISTES. *What do you call the Gift, which is offer'd, before Consecration?* ORTHODOXUS. *Food made of certain Grains.* ERAN. *And how do you call the other Symbol?* ORTHOD. *We give it a common Name, which signifies a Drink.* ERAN. *How do you call them after the Consecration?* ORTHOD. *The Body and Blood of Christ.* ERAN. *And do you believe, that you receive the Body and Blood of Christ?* ORTHOD. *I do believe it.* ERAN. *As therefore the Symbols of Christ's Body and Blood are one Thing before Consecration, but are changed, and made other Things after Consecration, so Christ's Body after his Ascension was changed into the divine Substance.* ORTHOD. *You are taken in your own Nets. For the Mystical Signs depart not from their own Nature by Consecration. For they remain in their former Substance, and*

Form and Shape, and are Visible and tangible as before. But they are understood to be the Things, which they are made, and so they are believed, and they are adored, as being the Things, which they are believed.

These are *Theodore's* Words. But if any Man can conclude from them that he denies either the *Real Presence* or *Transubstantiation* without Making him contradict himself, I will own he has a Talent at Reconciling Contradictions, which I am yet a Stranger to.

The Reason hereof is clear, because he grants *first*, that the Gift, which was *Bread and Wine* before Consecration is after the Consecration call'd the *Body and Blood of Christ*. *2dly*, that he believes it to be the *Body and Blood of Christ*. And *3dly*, that they are adored, as being the Things, which they are believed. Now if this be not Professing the *real Presence* and *Transubstantiation*, no *Papist* has ever made a Profession of that Article of his Faith. Nay *Eranistes* lays it down as a Principle agree'd on by both Sides, that the *Mystical Symbols of Bread and Wine are changed, and made the Body and Blood of Christ by Consecration*, and concludes from it, that in the same Manner *Christ's Body* was after his *Ascension* changed into the *Divine Substance*: which Argumentation would be wholly impertinent if both *Orthodoxus* and *Eranistes* did not believe the Change of the *Bread and Wine* into the *Body and Blood of Christ*.

» G. My Lord, *Theodore* writes, as you have observed, against the *Eutychians*, who said, that the
 » human Nature of *Christ* was absorpt, or swallow'd up
 » in the Divinity. So that there remain'd now none but
 » the Divine Nature in him, and that he was no more
 » a Man; and used this Comparison, that it was in
 » like Manner as in the Sacrament, where the *Bread*
 » was changed into the *Body of Christ*. Yes, said *Theo-*

doret, it is in the same Manner, that is, in no Manner at all. For that the Bread, tho changed in it's Use and Significancy, yet lost not it's Nature, but remain'd truly and properly Bread as before. But had he believed *Transubstantiation*, this had been a full and absolute Confirmation of the *Eutychian Heresy* instead of a Confutation. For then there had remain'd no more of the humane Nature in *Christ*, than you believe the Substance of the Bread to remain in the Sacrament. This explains the Meaning of *Theodoret* even beyond his Words. pag. 148. "

L. Beyond his Words indeed. For surely never were a Man's Words more foully misrepresented. First, instead of *Theodoret's* Saying, you are taken in your own Nets; you make him speak thus, yes it is in the same Manner; that is, in no Manner at all: Which (besides the Falsification of his Words) is a manifest Contradiction to his Professing immediately before, that he believed the Gift, which was Bread and Wine before Consecration, to be the Body and Blood of *Christ* after the Consecration. 2dly, Your Fixing upon *Theodoret* this Meaning, viz. that the Bread is changed only in it's Use and Significancy, but remains truly and properly Bread, is no less a Contradiction to his Words immediately following, wherein he declares that the Symbols after the Consecration are understood to be the Things which they are made; that they are believed to be so, and are adored as being the Things they are believed. For I appeal to common Sense whether all this can be spoken of a Change barely in Use and Significancy.

I add, that if *Theodoret* meant no more than a Change in Use and Significancy, it will follow contrary to all Probability, that he has made his *Eutychian* Adversary argue the most childishly imaginable. For his Argument would run thus, as the Bread

and *Wine* are changed only in Use and Significancy, so the *Humanity of Christ* is really changed into the *Divinity*. Which being most eminently absurd cannot be attributed to *Theodoret* with any Colour of Reason. And 'tis an unanswerable Proof, that *Orthodoxus* and *Eranistes*, that is, *Theodoret*, and the *Eutychian* his Adversary agree'd in this common Principle of their Faith, viz. that the *Bread* and *Wine* are by Consecration really changed into the *Body* and *Blood of Christ*; because he makes it the Ground and Foundation of the *Eutychian's* Argument or Similitude to set forth the Change made in the *Humanity of Christ* after his *Ascension* into Heaven. Which is the particular Branch of *Eutychianism* attack'd by *Theodoret* in the Passage quoted, as appears from *Eranistes's* Words.

G. But, My Lord, how is this consistent with *Theodoret's* telling the *Eutychian*, that he is taken in his own nets? For if they both supposed a real and Substantial Change in the Sacrament, the Similitude came home to the Point, and could not be retorted upon *Eranistes*.

L. This, Sr, is the knot of the Difficulty; to which I answer directly; that the Mystery of the holy Eucharist according to Catholick Doctrine contains two Things. 1. That the *Bread* and *Wine* are substantially changed into the *Body* and *Blood of Christ*. And 2^{ly}, that the *Accidents*, or natural Proprieties of *Bread* and *Wine*, as *Figure*, *Tast*, *Colour*, &c. remain the same they were before. This latter Truth *Theodoret* expresses by telling *Eranistes*, that the *Mystical Signs* depart not from their former Nature by Consecration, but are visible and tangible as before; which being a Principle agree'd to by his Adversary, *Theodoret* had just Reason to tell him, that he was taken in his own Nets, in Drawing a Similitude from a

Mystery to establish his Error, which very Mystery contain'd a Confutation of it. For immediately after the Passage quoted, he concludes, that as the Symbols after Consecration retain all their former *natural Proprieties*, so the Body of Christ even after his Resurrection and Ascension was *circumscribed, visible, and tangible*, and had all the Qualities of a human Body glorified.

'Tis true, *Eranistes* lays the whole Strefs of his Argument upon the *substantial Change* wrought in the *Sacrament*; as every man, that argues rationally, is supposed to set the best Foot foremost: but *Orthodoxus* takes the Advantage against him from the other Part of the Mystery; *viz.* the *natural Proprieties* of Bread and Wine remaining after the Consecration, and infers from it, that therefore the *natural Proprieties* of Christ's Body always remain'd; which he tells *Eranistes* is *taking him in his own Nets*. Because tho' all agreed that the *natural Proprieties* of Bread and Wine remain without their *Substance* in the *Sacrament*, no Man ever said that the *natural Proprieties* of Christ's Body ever were without his *real Body*; and so it follow'd by a clear Consequence from the very Similitude insisted upon by *Eranistes*, that the *Humanity* of Christ was not absorpt in the *Divinity*, and that there were always *two real Natures* in Christ; the Disbelief whereof was the capital Error of the *Eutychians*.

All this shews plainly, how little Reason you have to say, that if Theodoret had believed Transubstantiation, it had been a full and absolute Confirmation of the Eutychian Heresy instead of a Confutation. For, to speak properly, the Doctrine of Transubstantiation is neither a Confirmation nor Confutation of the *Eutychian Heresy*; nor has it any more Connection with it than the Change of *Moses's Rod* into a *Serpent*; or

the Change of Water into Wine at Cana in Galilee. But since the *Eutychians* drew a Similitude from one Part of the Mystery of *Transubstantiation* to colour their Error, *Theodoret* had Reason to answer them in their own Way, and a just title to take the Advantage of the other Part of that Mystery against them. So that nothing is more frivolous than what you add; viz. that (if *Theodoret* believed *Transubstantiation*) then there had remain'd no more of the human Nature in Christ, than we believe the Substance of Bread to remain in the Sacrament. For you may with just as much good Sense infer the same Consequence, if *Theodoret* believed that *Moses's Rod* was changed into a *Serpent*, or that Christ changed Water into Wine: both which Miracles I presume *Theodoret* believed without Prejudice to the Catholick Cause.

G. But, My Lord, *Theodoret* says positively, that the *Mystical Signs* depart not from their own Nature by Consecration.

L. No more they do in *Theodoret's* Sense: because the *Mystical Signs*, that is, the *Accidents* remain the same after, as they were before Consecration. Now *Accidents* have their proper Nature and Essence as well as Substance; and the natural Proprieties of Things are often call'd their Nature: As we say, it is the Nature of Ice to be cold, of Water to moisten, and of Fire to burn. So St *Hilary* Lib. 10. de Trin. says, that Fire in the Babilonian Furnace lost it's Nature. And in the very same Sense *Theodoret* Speaks, when he says, that the *Mystical Signs* depart not from their own Nature, that is, their natural Proprieties by Consecration.

G. Ay but *Theodoret* says more. For he adds, that they remain in their former Substance, and Form and Shape, and are Visible, and Tangible as before.

L. He do's so. But pray, Sr, take the very next Words

words with them. But they are understood to be the Things, which they are made; and so they are believed, and they are ADORED, as being the Things, which they are believed. That is, the true Body and Blood of Christ; as he profess'd to believe a few Lines before. This, Sr, explains *Theodore*'s Meaning, and shews, that he takes the Word *Substance*, not as it is opposite to *Accidents*, but for a Collection of them, as *Form, Shape, Visibibility, Tangibility, &c.* For otherwise his Meaning will be, that, tho the *Bread* and *Wine* be changed into the *Body* and *Blood* of Christ; and, tho the Things, into which they are changed, are to be adored, yet they are Nothing but plain *Bread* and *Wine* after, as they were before Consecration; which is both a *Contradiction* and *Blasphemy*. 'Tis a *Contradiction* to say, that *Bread* and *Wine* retaining in all *Respects* their former Nature are changed and made the *Body* and *Blood* of Christ: And it is *Blasphemy* to say, that *Bread* remaining plain *Bread* is to be adored: And nothing can clear *Theodore* either from the one or the other, but taking the Word *Substance* for a Collection of *Natural Proprieties*.

G. But where do's your Lordship find the Word, *Substance* ever taken in that Sense?

L. Sr, the *English* Word *Substance* do's not bear so large a Sense, as *Substantia* in *Latin*, or *ὑπόστασις* in *Greek*; which is the Word *Theodore* makes Use of in the Text quoted. And therefore, tho it be improper in *English* to give to *Accidents* the Denomination of *Substance*, it is not so in the other two Languages. *Aristotle*, who as a *Philosopher* is supposed to follow the strictest Laws of Speech, writes thus *Lib. 5. Metaph. C. 8.* The Word *Substance* [ὑπόστασις] may be taken in two different Senses. First, for the last Subject [and this we properly call *Substance* in *English*] 2dly, FOR ANY ACCIDENT, THO SEPARABLE FROM THE THING. And thus the *Latin* Word *Substantia* is taken by

St Peter Chrysologus saying, a glorious Body is changed in Substance, but not in Person. *Mutasse Substantiam, sed non mutasse Personam.* Serm. 82. and by St Austin Saying, Man by Sin fell from the Substance, in which he was made. *Per iniquitatem homo lapsus est a Substantia, in qua factus est.* Psal. 69. In both which Places the Word Substance is taken for accidental Qualities. Which suffices abundantly to justify my Answer. However if you can find me any other English Word to answer the full Extent of the Greek *ουσια*, or the Latin *Substantia*, I shall be obliged to you for it, and use it for the future in Translating the Text, you have objected from *Theodoret*.

„ G. My Lord, *Theodoret* says in the same Place,
 „ that our blessed Saviour, who call'd himself the living
 „ Bread and the Vine, has also honour'd the visible Signs
 „ with the Title and Appellation of his Body and Blood,
 „ not changing their Nature, but adding to Nature Grace.
 „ pag. 148.

„ L. Sr, this Passage is not in the same Place with the former, but is taken from *Theodoret's* first Dialogue. However the principal Difficulty it contains is already answer'd. For since the *Visible Signs* lose nothing of their *Natural Qualities* by Consecration, they may properly be said not to be changed in their Nature: And the Grace, which *Theodoret* says is added to Nature, is Christ himself; of whom St Paul says, the Grace of God, that bringeth Salvation, has appear'd to all Men. Tit. II. 5. II.

As to *Theodoret's* saying, that Christ, who call'd himself the living Bread and the Vine, has also honour'd the visible Signs with the Title and Appellation of his Body and Blood: his true Meaning is, that the Elements, which of their own Nature are nothing but Bread and Wine, are honour'd with the Title and Appellation of Christ's Body and Blood, by being made his true Body and

Blood by the Words of Consecration: As a Man of a mean Extraction is said to be honour'd with the Title of Lord or Duke, when he is really made one. And that this is *Theodore's* Meaning is manifest from his own Words immediately preceding the Piece you have quoted. ERANISTES *I should be glad to know why the Names are changed.* ORTHODOXUS. *The Reason is evident to those that understand the Mystery. For Christ would not have us regard the Nature of what we see. But as the Names of the Elements are changed, so to apprehend by Faith the Change, which is made in them by Grace.*

I shall conclude with a Passage from *Theodore*, where treating profess'dly of the Sacrament, I presume he will speak his Mind plainly. Christ (says he) at his last Supper shew'd the TRUE ORIGINAL, of which the Paschal Lamb was a TYPE; open'd the Gates of the holy Sacrament, and gave his PRECIOUS BODY AND BLOOD not only to the eleven Apostles, but also to the Traitor Judas.----- Those Words, [he shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of our Lord] mean this: that as Judas betray'd him, and the Jews insulted him, so they offer him a very great Affront, who take his MOST HOLY BODY with unclean Hands, and put it into a defiled Mouth. in 1. Cor. C. 11.

Here he declares first, that the Body and Blood of Christ are truly contain'd in the Sacrament: and 2dly, that they are given to all Communicants both Good, and Bad. And let any Man now Judge, whether this be not Papistical Doctrine. Nay the four Protestant Centuriators acknowledge *Theodore* to be an Abettor of Transubstantiation. *Theodore* (say they) affirms dangerously, that the Symbols of the Body and Blood of Christ after the Invocation of the Priest are changed, and become another Thing. Cent. 5. C. 10. Let us now consider, whether any other amongst the Fathers will be more favourable to you.

GELASIUS, and FACUNDUS HERMIANENSIS.

„ G. Pope *Gelasius* says , that the Sacrament of the
 „ Body and Blood of Christ , which we take , is a Divine
 „ Thing , by which we are made Partakers of the Divine
 „ Nature : and yet it ceases not to be the Substance and
 „ Nature of Bread and Wine. And certainly (says he)
 „ the Image and Similitude of the Body and Blood of Christ
 „ is celebrated in the Mysteries.

„ And *Facundus* says the same. Not (says he) that
 „ the Bread is properly his Body , or the Cup his Blood ,
 „ but that they contain the Mystery of his Body and Blood.
 „ pag. 149.

L. Sr , what has been already said to *Theodoret* , will fully answer *Gelasius* ; who makes the same Comparison as *Theodoret* did , and almost in the same Terms. His Design too is the same , viz. to shew , that , as the natural Proprieties of Bread and Wine , tho changed into the Body and Blood of Christ , remain after Consecration ; so after the Incarnation there remain all the natural Proprieties of human Nature , and by Consequence the human Nature itself in Christ.

But pray , Sr , who has priviledg'd you not only to suppress a material Part of his Words , but even to alter in your Translation the broken Piece you have quoted , by Substituting *And* instead of *Or* ? For *Gelasius* says not Substance AND Nature , but Substance OR Nature. It ceases not (says he) to be the Substance or Nature of Bread and Wine : and he seems to have design'dly used the Particle , or , to mollify the Harshness of the preceding Word *Substance* , and make Way for his own following Explanation , viz. that the Sacraments by the divine Operation of the Holy Ghost pass into the DIVINE SUBSTANCE ; yet remain in the PROPRIETY of their Nature : which you have

wholly omitted; because it is rank Popery, and makes *Gelasius* a Witness for Transubstantiation.

As to his Saying, that the Image and Similitude of the Body and Blood of Christ is celebrated in the Action of the Mysteries; it imports no more than what Children are taught in their Catechism, viz. that the Eucharist is the Sacrament of our Saviour's Body and Blood: Because every Sacrament is a Sign or Image of the Thing it contains. And the Words of *Facundus Herminianensis* saying, that they contain the Mystery of Christ's Body and Blood, will bear the same Meaning. For the Eucharist, or Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood is certainly a great Mystery; and every Roman Catholick in the World will subscribe to his Saying, that the Bread is not properly his Body, nor the Wine his Blood: but that they are changed into his Body and Blood. Have you any more Fathers to quote?

G. Yes, My Lord, St *Austin*, and St *Chrysostom*.

L. St *Austin* and St *Chrysostom* do you say? Then I fear you are in a bad Way. But let us have St *Austin* first.

ST. AUGUSTIN.

G. St *Austin* says, if Sacraments did not bear some *Similitude to the Things*, of which they are the Sacraments, they would not be Sacraments at all. But from this Similitude they often take the Name of the Things themselves. As, say he, the Sacrament of Faith, which is Baptism, is call'd Faith. pag. 149. "

L. Sir, I have more Difficulty to find an Objection in these Words of St *Austin*, than to give an Answer to it. For I do not see what other Sense St *Austin's* Words will bear, than that as every Sacrament is a visible Sign of invisible Grace, Christ has in-

stituted such *visible Signs* for Sacraments, as bear some Similitude to the peculiar Grace they produce. As *Bread* and *Wine*, which are nourishing Things, and the Matter of the holy *Eucharist*, Signify the *Spiritual Nourishment* of our Souls, which is the peculiar Grace of that Sacrament; and it is therefore call'd the *Nourishment of our Souls*. And so of all the other Sacraments.

But let us now hear St *Austin* deliver three Truths diametrically opposite to the general *Protestant Doctrine*.

First, that *Christ's* Immortal *Body* is really present upon the *Altar* under the *Sacramental Signs*.

2dly, that we receive it not only with our *Hearts*, but also with our *Mouths*. And

3dly, that it is actually received even by the *unworthy Communicant*.

The *first* of these we have in his *Confessions*, where he writes thus of his Mother. *She desired to be remember'd at thy Altar, whereat she had been constantly present without Missing any one Day: and FROM WHENCE SHE KNEW WAS DISPENSED THE HOLY VICTIM, by which the Hand-writing that was against us, was blotted out, and by which the Enemy was conquer'd, that number'd our Sins.* Lib. 9. Conf. C. 13.

The *2d*. *We receive with a faithful Heart and MOUTH Jesus-Christ giving us his Flesh to eat, and his Blood to drink: Tho it be more shocking to eat Man's Flesh, than to kill it, and to drink Man's Blood, than to shed it.* L. 2, *contra Adversarium legis & Prophetarum*.

And the *3d* in these Words. *They, who, as the Apostle says, eat and drink Damnation to themselves, yet EAT THE VERY FLESH OF CHRIST, AND DRINK HIS VERY BLOOD.* Serm. II. de Verbis Domini. C. II.

All these are necessary Consequences of *Transubstantiation*, and shew plainly that a meer *Figurative*

9. 26. *Objections from the Fathers.* 167
or *Symbolical Presence* are contrary to *St Austin's Doctrine*.

He adds (in *Psal. 98. v. 5.*) that no *Man eats the Flesh of Christ*, but he adores it first. As likewise (in *Psal. 33.*) that *Christ* upon the *Altar* is offer'd in *Sacrifice*. There was, as you know (says he) formerly a *Sacrifice of the Jews* according to the *Order of Aaron* in *Victims of Cattle*, and this is a *Mystery*. There was not then the *Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of our Lord*, which the *Faithful*, and those that have read the *Gospel* know: which *Sacrifice* is now spread over all the *World*.

And is not then *St Austin* a very proper Judge for a *Protestant* to appeal to? Now let us hear *St Chrysostom*.

ST CHRYSOSTOM.

G. *St Chrysostom* speaking of the *Vessels*, in which the *Sacrament* was put, in *Which* (says he) there is *not the true Body of Christ*, but the *Mystery of his Body* is contain'd in them. *Opere imperf. in Math.* and *Epist. ad Cæsarium.* in *Biblioth. P. Col.* 1618. "

L. *Sr*, the *Author* of the *Book* you have quoted is not *St Chrysostom*, but a rank *Heretick*. And you yourself must own him to be one, unless you will maintain it to be *Orthodox Doctrine*, 1. that *Marriage* is of itself a *Sin*. 2. that a *second Marriage* is only an *honest Fornication*: and 3. that the *Catholick Doctrine of the Divinity of Christ* is the *Homousian Heresy*: all which, and many other *Errors* are scatter'd up and down in the *Writings* of that *Author*.

The *Epistle to Cæsarius* is likewise suspected to be spurious by the learned. But this all Men of Sense must grant, that if it contradicts *St Chrysostom's* constant *Doctrine* in his undoubted *Works*, it ought to be rejected. Let us then hear *himself* speak, and

he will teach us these three considerable Truths

First, that the *Body and Blood of Christ* are in the *sacred Vessels*.

2dly, that the *Body of Christ* is at the same Time in *Heaven*, and upon *Earth*.

And 3dly, that we must not trust our *Senses* in this *Mystery*: tho you told me but a while ago, and were positive in it, that *God* never said, nor did any Thing to contradict *Man's Senses*.

The first Truth is deliver'd in the following Words. The *Apostle* (says *St Chrysostom*) tells us, that what is in the *CHALICE* is the same as that, which flow'd from his Side. And the wise Men adored that Body even Lying in the *Manger*: but you do not see it in a *Manger*, but upon the *ALTAR*. Hom. 24. in 1. Cor. C. 10. §. 16.

The second Truth is deliver'd by the same Father in the two following Passages. O *Miracle*! O *Divine Bounty*! He, who sits above at the *Right Hand* of the Father, is at the very same Instant in all Men's Hands. L. 3. de Sacerdotio. C. 4.

And again; This *Mystery* here changes for Thee *Earth* into *Heaven*----- For I will shew thee here placed upon *Earth* even that, which is most precious and Adorable in *Heaven*.---- The *Body of [Christ]* the King is the most magnificent Thing in *Heaven*; but you may now see it upon *Earth*. Hom. de sancto Philogonio.

The 3d Truth is thus set forth at large by *St Chrysostom*. Let us always believe *God*, and not contradict him, THO THAT, WHICH HE SAYS, SEEMS TO CONTRADICT BOTH OUR THOUGHTS, AND OUR SENSES.--- For his Words cannot deceive us, but OUR SENSES MAY BE EASILY DECEIVED. He never errs, but THESE ARE OFTEN MISTAKEN. Since therefore he says, This is my *Body*, let us be fully persuaded of it.---- How many say now, O that I could see him in his own Shape! Or his Cloaths, or any Thing about him! Believe me YOU SEE

HIM,

HIM, YOU TOUCH HIM, YOU EAT HIM. You would be content to see his Cloaths, and he lets you not only see him, but also touch him, and eat him, and receive him within you. Hom. 83. in S. Math.

And in the same Homily he tells us, the Priest's Office is only Ministerial, but that the Elements are Sanctified and CHANGED by Christ.

Here we have both Transubstantiation clearly taught, and the grand Protestant Objection from it's Contradiction to our Senses fully answer'd. And had I not Reason to tell you, it would go badly with you, if either St Austin, or St Chrysostom were to give Verdict. Believe me, Sr, whenever you appeal to the Fathers, whether Greek or Latin, you put yourself into the Hands of Enemies, and must expect to succeed accordingly.

§. 27.

The Gentlemans unseasonable Boasting.

6. MY Lord, not to trouble you with more Quotations, I refer you to Bishop Cosin's History of Transubstantiation: where beginning at the Institution, he sets down in every Century the Words of the Fathers upon this Point. A little Book long since printed both in English and Latin, not yet answer'd (that I hear) and I believe unanswerable. Wherein you will see a Cloud of Witnesses, through the first Ages of the Church, and so downwards in perfect Contradiction to this new Article of your Faith.

And as the Scriptures, primitive Church, and Fathers are all against you, so have you Nothing but an unintelligible Jargon of Metaphysics, upon which the Scholmen ring Changes, till the Noise

» of their Bells have deafen'd common *Sense* and
 » *Reason*. Such are their Subtilties upon *Substance*,
 » *Accidents*, *Subsistence*, *Modusses*, and *Modalities*,
 » and many more such *Quiddities*; and their *Dis-*
 » *tinctions* of *Materialiter* and *formaliter*, *per se*, and
 » *per Accidens*, and a thousand more to solve all *Dis-*
 » *sculties*, and reconcile *Contradictions*. No Absurdity
 » can be named out of the Reach of a *Distinction*.
 » And when we understand it not, it operates most
 » effectually, because then we may suppose there is
 » something in it. pag. 150.

L. Truly, Sr, to hear you swagger at this wild Rate, one would think you had an Adversary at your Feet begging for Quarter. But if you be in this *Gasconading* Humor, when you ought to be sensible, that you just come from being driven out of all your Entrenchments, how would you proclaim your Victory with Beat of Drum, and Sound of Trumpet, had the Advantage of any one Argument been visibly on your Side?

You began the Attack with Arguments from *Scripture*: but finding your own Artillery turn'd against you, you made Hast to call the *Senses* to your Assistance, and these you bragg'd of as an *invincible Host*. But they were unable to stand their Ground against plain *Scriptural* Facts, *common Experience* and *Reason*. Lastly, you hall'd into the Field some *Fathers*; the greatest Part of them most wretchedly *disguised* or *mangled*; and you would needs force them to maintain a Cause, against which they all solemnly protest, when they are allow'd to speak their own Minds. Yet you have the Confidence to tell me with a serious Air, that *Scriptures*, *primitive Church* and *Fathers* are all against me, and that I have Nothing in the World on my Side but an unintelligible Jargon of *Metaphysicks*, with a Deal more of such Rodomontado-Stuff.

However I must own you have managed the *Fathers* with most exquisite Skill, sometimes by the most strain'd and contradictory Interpretations, and other Times by Suppressing some *Material Part* of the Text, which might serve as a Key to open the true Sense and Meaning of the Author. By the Help of these ingenious Artifices the *Fathers* may be made meer *Punchinello's*, or speaking Trumpets, and in Spite of their *great Age* be taught the modern *Protestant* Language, which they were utter Strangers to 1200 Years ago.

But you refer me to Dr *Cosin's* *unanswerable History of Transubstantiation*, and particularly to his Quotations from the *Fathers*; out of which you thought fit to choose to the Number of *seven*. And I presume I may be allow'd to have that good Opinion both of your Judgment, and zeal for the Cause, as not to doubt, but that out of the numerous Quotations, with which Dr *Cosin* has cramm'd his Book, you have pick'd the very *Choiceest*. For 'tis not reasonable to suppose, that a judicious Collector, who had so much Choice before him, would leave the best, and take the worst. Whence it is obvious to guess, what Sort of Lumber you have left behind, when the wretched ones, you have made Choice of, are the very best of the Bunch. One of your Quotations, is taken from an *Hereiick* instead of an *Orthodox Father*. Your Mentioning St *Chrysostom*, and St *Austin* have served for no other Purpose than to give me a fair Occasion to shew how flatly those two Fathers are against you: *three* other *Fathers* are downright falsified. For *Origen's* Words are clipp'd to conceal their true Meaning; and in your Quotations from *Theodore*t and *Gelasius* you have practis'd the Art both of *Clipping* and *Coining*. Thus, after all your Boasting, your Quotations turn only to your Confusion:

And if these be the most *select* ones of your *unanswerable Doctor*, it will be no Rashness to Judge, that the rest of his Quotations are either nothing to the Purpose, or that he has taken Care to cook and dress them with the same exquisite Skill, as some of those you have already entertain'd me with.

§. 28.

Some Animadversions upon Dr Colin's History of Transubstantiation.

BUT, to come to a closer Examination of that Author, I perceive it is his Example has encouraged you to that wild and defenceless Assertion, viz. *that the whole primitive Church, and all the Fathers are against us.* For I find him under the same Sort of *Delirium*, pag. 159. where he tells us, *that Transubstantiation is a meer Novelty, invented about the Middle of the twelfth Century, and confirm'd by no Ecclesiastical or Papal Decree before the Year 1215.* This I own is Laying the Ax to the Root, if the *Doctor* can make Good what he says. For, if he can prove, *that the Doctrine of Transubstantiation is a Novelty invented about the Middle of the twelfth Century*, he certainly gains his Cause: But, instead of that, he has deprived himself of the very Possibility of Proving it by what he writes, pag. 137. which is a flat Contradiction to it. His Words are these. *At last a new Form of Retraction was imposed on Berengarius, whereby he was henceforth to confess under Pain of the Pope's high Displeasure, that the Mystick Bread is substantially turn'd into the true and proper Flesh of Christ.*

Here, Sr, if you can bring off your *unanswerable Author*, you will do him a Signal Piece of Service. *Berengarius* began to broach his new Doctrine concer-

ning the *Eucharist* about three Years before the Middle of the *Eleventh Century*, and one Article of his Heresy was, *that the Bread and Wine are not changed by Consecration into the Body and Blood of Christ*: as appears plainly from the very Form of Retraction, which he was obliged to make in these remarkable Words. *I Berengarius with my Heart believe, and with my Tongue confess, that the Bread and Wine, which are placed upon the Altar, are by the Mystery of holy Prayer, and the Words of our Redeemer substantially changed into the true and proper and Life-giving Flesh and Blood of our Lord Jesus-Christ.* This, Sr, is the Retraction, Dr Cosin speaks of; and was made in the Roman Council under Pope Gregory VII. the 79th Year of the *Eleventh Century*.

Now, if it be true, (as it most certainly is) what the Doctor tells us, pag. 137. that *Berengarius* was obliged to make a publick Profession of the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* in the *Eleventh Century* (in which he lived and died) I desire to know how it can likewise be true, what he tells us, pag. 159. that *Transubstantiation* is a Novelty invented about the Middle of the *Twelfth*! unless a Doctrine can be profess'd about four Score Years before it is invented: This I think is a sufficient Warning to any Man not to believe the Doctor upon his bare Word.

But, setting aside the Grossness of this palpable Contradiction, which is no small Blemish in an unanswerable Piece, the Falseness of his historical Account may be demonstrated from unquestionable Facts. *Transubstantiation* (says the Doctor) was invented about the Middle of the *twelfth Century*; yet all the Learned know, that *Berengarius* began to write against it about the Year 1047. that is, about a hundred Years before the Doctor's Epocha.

Nay his new Scheme of a meer *Figurative* or *Sym-*

bolical Presence no sooner appear'd in publick, but was oppos'd by the most learned Writers of that Age, and condemn'd the first Time in a Council held at *Rome* under *Leo IX.* anno 1050. and the same Year in two Councils more, one held at *Vercelles*, the other at *Paris*. 5 Years after, it was again condemn'd in two Councils, one held at *Florence*, the other at *Tours*. And four Years after that in a Council at *Rome* under *Nicholas II.* in which Council *Berengarius* threw his own Writings into the Fire; tho (as Bishop *Lanfrank* fear'd) with a bended body, but not an humbled Heart, *inclinato Corpore, sed non humiliato corde*. After that it was again condemn'd in a Council at *Roïen* anno 1063. in another at *Poitiers* anno 1075. and in two others at *Rome* under *Gregory VII.* anno 1078. and anno 1097.

Thus was *Berengarius's* Doctrine against *Transubstantiation* condemn'd by 10 Provincial Councils during his Life; and seven Years after his Death (which happen'd Anno 1088.) it was again condemn'd in a numerous Council at *Plaisance*, in which the Decree is thus express'd, *that the Bread and Wine, when they are consecrated upon the Altar, are truly and essentially changed into the Body and Blood of our Lord, and not in Figure only.* Tom. 10. Conc. Lab. pag. 502.

Now, Sr, these undoubted Facts are first an unanswerable Proof, that the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* was believed by the Church in the Middle of the Eleventh Century; and it could not be then believed, if it was first invented about the Middle of the twelfth; that is, about a hundred Years after; as the Doctor tells us.

They are likewise an unanswerable Proof of the Falseness of what he adds, viz. *that it was not confirm'd by any Ecclesiastical or Papal Decree before the Year 1215.* For I take it to be an undoubted Truth, that

the *Eleventh* Century was before the *thirteenth*. And I think the *Decrees* of eleven *Provincial Councils*, at some of which the *Pope* himself *presided* in Person, may properly be call'd *Ecclesiastical*, and *Papal Decrees*. So that the *Doctor* is most grievously out in both the Parts of his Story.

G. My Lord, the *Word Transubstantiation* never was heard of till the fourth *Lateran Council* which was held An. 1215. So far therefore Dr *Cosin* has Truth on his Side.

L. But other *Words* equivalent to it were frequently heard of even amongst the *Ancient Fathers*, as I have already instanced in some, and shall instance in more immediately. But, Sr, are we Disputing about the *Word Transubstantiation*, or the *Doctrine* signified by that *Word*? Has Dr *Cosin* writ his elaborate History only to prove that *Transubstantiation* is a new *Word*? Or was there any Need of forty Quotations from the *Fathers* to decide this weighty Point? Truly, Sr, tho I have but a very indifferent Opinion of the *Doctor's* Performance, I cannot think him such an errant Trifler, as this would make him.

You know as well as I that the Thing signified by the *Word Transubstantiation* is a *Change of one Substance into another*. And in Relation to the *Eucharist* it signifies a *Change of the Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ made by the Words of Consecration*. And the Question is not, whether the *Word Transubstantiation* be *Old* or *New*, or when it was first made Use of to signify that *Mystery*; but whether the *Mystery* signified by it be the *Ancient Faith* of the *Church*. Nay I have so good an Opinion of the *Doctor's* Judgment as to presume he means the *Doctrine itself*, and not the *Word*, when he tells us, that *Transubstantiation* is a *Novelty* invented about

the Middle of the twelfth Century, and that it was not confirm'd by any Ecclesiastical or Papal Decree before the Year 1215.

But, if he flinks away from the *true Question*, and means no more than to trifle about the *Word*, I know not where he will find an Adversary, and I am very ready to grant, that as the *Word Consubstantial* was first made Use of in the great *Council of Nice* to express the *Divinity of Christ* against the *Arians*, and that as this was not Coining a new *Article of Faith*, but only a new *Word* to express the *Ancient Faith* more clearly; so in like Manner the *Word Transubstantiation* was first used in the *Lateran Council* held An. 1215. to express the *Ancient Faith* of the *Church* in Relation to the *Mystery* of the holy *Eucharist*.

But what is all this to the Doctor's Purpose? Is this a Consequence becoming a Man of Sense and Learning, *the Word Transubstantiation was not generally made Use of before the Year 1215. therefore the Doctrine signified by it is a Novelty, and was not confirm'd by any Ecclesiastical or Papal Decree before that Time!* If you have Nothing better to say in Defense of your *Unanswerable* Author, it will go hard with him in the Judgment of all unbyass'd Men. For, as to the *Doctrinal Part* in Question, I have already demonstrated from undeniable Facts, that the *Doctrine of Transubstantiation* was believed by the *Church* in the *Eleventh Century*; and that by Consequence it was not a *Novelty* invented about the *Middle of the twelfth*. From the same unquestionable Facts I have demonstrated, that, if the *Eleventh Century* was by good Computation before the *thirteenth*, the same Doctrine was confirm'd by eleven *Provincial Councils*; or *Ecclesiastical Decrees* before the Year 1215. And this is a full and plain Confutation of the chief Article of the *Doctor's History*; which was to fix the *Epocha* of the general

general Belief of *Transubstantiation* no higher than the *thirteenth Century*.

But to give you still a more ample Demonstration of the *Doctor's* fruitful Invention, and Skill in *Romancing*, he tells us, *pag. 131. that almost all the French, Italians, and English of those Times were of Berengarius's Opinion. And pag. 132. that it was maintain'd by many famous Nations.* A Man must surely have a very large Stock of Confidence to assert two Facts so notoriously false. For, *First*, if almost all the *French, Italians, and English* held *Berengarius's* Doctrine, and if it was maintain'd by *many famous Nations*, how came it to pass, that in the very Age he lived in, there were *eleven Provincial Councils* call'd to condemn it, and not one to approve or defend it either in *Italy, France, or England*, or any other Nation of the known *World*? Were all the *famous Nations*, the *Doctor* speaks of, intoxicated with *Wine*, or laid fast asleep with *Opium*, that they could not stand up for the common Cause of *Religion*, nor oppose *Councils* against *Councils* to support the sinking Credit of their Champion, and save him from being run down by Numbers! Or must we suppose it to be the common Practice of *Bishops* to define a Doctrine contrary to their own Conscience and Belief! Such pretty Suppositions as these may indeed relieve the *Doctor* in some Measure: But without their Help 'tis impossible for any Man in his right Senses to believe, that *many famous Nations*, nay even one single *famous Nation* was for *Berengarius*, when there are no noted Facts to render it credible, and innumerable ones to disprove it.

2dly, If *Berengarius* asserted the *ancient Doctrine*, and had so *many famous Nations* for him, I ask, whether the *Greeks* were of the Number of these *famous Nations*? For I am sure the *Western Nations* were all

against him. And if the *Greeks* were for him, why did they not engage openly in his Quarrel? They were at that Time so exasperated against the *Latins*, that they even reproach'd them with the most trivial Things, as *Shaving their Beards*, *Eating Hogs-flesh*, and *Consecrating in unleaven'd Bread*; but never accused them of any Error relating to the subject in Question: which is a Demonstrative Proof, that the *Greeks* agree'd with the *Latins*, and were against *Berengarius* in this *Mystery*.

3dly, the most learned Writers of the *Eleventh* Age knew nothing of the many famous Nations, the *Doctor* speaks of; and I may modestly presume, they could not be ignorant of the Religion profess'd in any noted Nation of *Christendom*.

Hugh Bishop of *Langres* in *France* writing to *Berengarius*, told him, that he Scandaliz'd the whole Church: *Universalem Ecclesiam scandalizas*.

Durandus Abbot of *Troarn* in *Normandy* told him, he impugn'd the Doctrine of the whole Catholick Church. *Quod Catholica per Orbem universum predicat Ecclesia*.

Lanfrank Primate of *England*, and a Man of extraordinary Parts in the Beginning of his Book against *Berengarius* tells him he holds an Opinion contrary to the whole World. *Contra Orbem sentire cæpisti*. And *Guilmond* Abbot of *Averse* told him, he was the Author of his Sect. It is (says he) notoriously known at this Time, that this mad Doctrine never was taught, before *Berengarius* began to run Mad. L. 3. *Notissimum est hoc tempore, priusquam Berengarius insanisset, hujusmodi insanias nunquam fuisse*. And in the same Book he reproaches him, that not even any poor Town or Village had received his Doctrine: *neque enim eis vel una Civitatula vel Villa concessit*. And pray, Sr, in what Part of the Terrestrial Globe were

then the many famous Nations discover'd since by your unanswerable Doctor?

§. 29.

The Antiquity of the Doctrine of Transubstantiation.

BUt, to return to that Piece of Doctor Cofin's History, where he tells us, that *Transubstantiation* was first invented about the Middle of the twelfth Century, I shall now produce some Testimonies of Fathers, that lived in the Fourth: and if these teach the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* as plainly as *Bellarmin* himself, then the Doctor must stand condemned. I have already fairly proved *St Austin* and *St Chrysostom* to be sound *Papists* in Relation to the Article in Question. To these I shall for Brevity's Sake only add four more, two *Greek*, and two *Latin* Fathers (for I omit a whole Cloud more of Venerable Witnesses) viz. *St Cyril of Jerusalem*, *St Gregory Nyssen*, *St Ambrose*, and *St Jerom*. Whoever cannot find the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* in these Fathers, must have very bad Eyes. I say the Doctrine; for I am not disposed to trifle about the Word.

St Cyril (Catech. Mystag. 4.) writes thus. *Jesus Christ* (says he) *in Cana of Galilee changed Water into Wine, which has some Affinity with Blood, by his Will only. And can we not believe him, THAT HE CHANGED THE WINE INTO HIS OWN BLOOD? ----- Let your Soul rejoice in the Lord being persuaded of it as a Thing most certain, that the Bread, which appears to our Eyes, is not Bread, tho our Taste do Judge it to be so, but that it is the Body of Jesus Christ. And that the Wine, which appears to our Eyes is not Wine, tho our Sense of Taste takes it for Wine, but that it is the Blood of Jesus Christ. Nothing can be plainer than this.*

St Gregory Nyssen in the same Century having said, that the immortal Body of Christ (is a powerful Preservative) is received into our Bowels, and then enquired, how this same Body, which is distributed to so many thousands of the Faithful over all the Earth, should be entire in each of these, and in each Part, which they receive, and yet not cease to remain entire in itself? He answers, because the visible Substance of Bread and Wine are changed into it. The Body of Christ, says he, is Deify'd by his Person. And therefore I have Reason to believe, that to this Day the Bread being sanctify'd by the Word of God IS CHANGED INTO THE BODY OF GOD THE SON. --- For there the Divine Person sanctify'd the Body, which had Bread for it's Nourishment, and so was as it were Bread. And here in like Manner, Bread, to use the Words of the Apostle, is sanctify'd by the Word of God and Prayer. Not so, that it is to be changed into the Body of Christ by Nourishing it; BUT THAT IT IS SUD- DENLY CHANGED INTO IT BY THESE WORDS, *this is my Body*; THE NATURE OF THOSE THINGS, THAT APPEAR, BEING TRANSELEMENTED INTO IT BY THE POWER OF CONSECRATION. In Orat. Catech. Cap. 37, T. 3. Edit. Par.

This I think is Teaching the *Doctrine of Transubstantiation*, tho the Word itself be not made Use of.

St Ambrose likewise teaches it so very plainly, that the Protestant Centurists made bold to give him a Reprimand for it, saying, *Ambrose did not write well of Transubstantiation*. Cent. 4. C. 4. Col. 295. It seems then he wrote of it; and since he lived above 700 Years before the middle of the *twelfth Century*, I know not what will become of Doctor *Cosin's Epocha*.

Let us then see, how he handles this Subject in his Book *de Initiatis*. Perhaps, says he, you may tell me I see another Thing, --- I must therefore prove, that

what you receive, is not that which Nature framed, but that, which the Benediction has consecrated; and that the Benediction has a greater Force than Nature. Moses held a Rod in his Hand, he threw it down, and it was made a Serpent. Again he took hold of the Serpent, and it return'd into the nature of a Rod --- The Rivers of Egypt ran with Streams of pure Water, when presently Blood gush'd forth out of the Fountain. There was no Water in the Rivers, and again at the Prayer of Moses the Blood ceased, and the Nature of Waters return'd ---

To those he adds other Miracles; viz. that when Moses held up his Rod, the Sea open'd a Passage for the Israelits. That Jordan ran back. That Moses brought Water out of a Rock by Striking it; and that Elisha made Iron Swim upon the Water contrary to it's Nature. Then he go's on thus. *We see therefore that Grace is stronger than Nature. Now, if a Man's Blessing could change the Course of Nature, what do we think of the Divine Consecration itself, in which the very Words of our Saviour operate? For the Sacrament, which you receive, is made by the Words of Christ. And if Elisha's Words were able to draw Fire from Heaven, will not Christ's Words be able to change the Species of the Elements? We read of all Creatures in the World, he said and they were made, he commanded, and they were created: Is not then the Word of Christ, which could give a Being to that, which had none, able to change those Things which are, into what they were not before? For it is not less to give new Natures to Things, than to change their Natures.*

Lastly St Jerom Epist. ad Heliod. writes thus. God forbid I should speak detractingly of those Men [Bishops] who succeeding the Apostles in their Functions do MAKE THE BODY OF CHRIST with their sacred Mouth.

These certainly are Authentic Witnesses of the *publick Faith* of the *Church* in their Times, both in Regard of their *Holiness* and *Learning*; and because they never were accused by the *Church* of any Error against Faith; which Censure they could not have escaped, had they been guilty of Broaching any Doctrine contrary to the *known Faith* of the *Universal Church*. Whence it is plain, that they taught no other Doctrine, than what they had received by a *constant Tradition* from the *Apostles*: for otherwise they would undoubtedly have been publicly censured for Introducing *Novelties* into the *Church*.

Even many *Protestants* convinced by these, and other numberless Testimonies of the *Ancient Fathers* have own'd the *Antiquity* of *Transubstantiation*. For besides the *Centurists*, who blame several Fathers by Name for teaching it, *Adamus Francisci* (margin. Theol. p. 256.) confesses that *Transubstantiation* enter'd early into the *Church*. And *Antonius de Adamo* another *Protestant Writer* (*Anat. Miss.* p. 36.) fairly owns, that he has not hitherto been able to know, when this *Opinion* of the real, and bodily Being of *Christ* in the *Sacrament* did begin. Which according to *St Austin's* Maxim against the *Donatists*, is Owning in Effect, that it had it's Beginning from *Christ*, and his *Apostles*.

Hence I may fairly conclude, that *Doctor Cofin's* Calling *Transubstantiation* a *Novelty* invented about the *Middle* of the *twelfth Century*, and your telling me, that the *Primitive Church* and *Fathers* are all against it, are two *Assertions* wholly void of Truth.

St Ignatius Bishop of *Antioch* in the very first Age a *Disciple* of the *Apostles*, and an illustrious *Martyr*, is alone sufficient to disprove both the *Doctor*, and yourself; and give us certain Information of what the *Primitive Church* believed and taught concerning the *Eucharist*. For in his *Genuine Epistle* to the *Church*

of *Smyrna* he has these remarkable Words (quoted also by *Theodoret*) of the *Hereticks* of his Time. They do not admit *Eucharists* and *Oblations*, because they do not confess, THAT THE EUCHARIST IS THE FLESH OF OUR SAVIOUR JESUS-CHRIST, WHICH SUFFER'D FOR OUR SINS, AND WHICH THE FATHER RAISED AGAIN BY HIS BOUNTY.

§. 30.

Transubstantiation not repugnant to the current Principles of Philosophy.

G. MY Lord, you have repeated many Times that the *Substance* of *Bread* and *Wine* are changed into the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*; but that the *Accidents* of both remain.

L. Well, Sr, what then?

G. Then I ask, whether you know the Difference betwixt *Substance* and *Accident*? pag. 150. "

L. Sr, when I was a Boy, I was taught to answer, that *Substance* is a *Being* which subsists by itself, And that the *Essence* of an *Accident* is not actual *Inhesion*, but a natural *Exigency* to inhere. So that, tho by a *Supernatural* Power it may exist without any *Subject*, it still retains it's *Essence*; because it naturally requires a *Subject*, even when it exists without one.

G. My Lord, this seems to be a *Philosophical Scheme* cook'd up expressly to make the hard Morfel of *Transubstantiation* go down the better.

L. Sr, I believe the *Cookery* do's not please your *Palate*. However 'tis good sound *Aristotelian Philosophy*. And *Aristotle* (who lived long enough before *Transubstantiation* was known in the *World*) could not easily be bribed by *Papists* to come in to their

Notions. Now he taught expressly, that *Accidents* are really distinguish'd, and may consequently by a *Supernatural Power* be *Separated* from their *Substance*: as we say they are in the *Sacrament* of the *holy Eucharist*. And so we cannot be said to have made a *precarious* Philosophical Scheme in Favour of *Transubstantiation*: since we only maintain, that it is not repugnant to current principles held for many hundred Years before Christianity was establish'd.

G. My Lord, when the *Substance* of Bread is gone, how can the *Figure*, and *Colour*, and *Tast* of it remain? » For then there will be *Accidents* of *Nothing*. » There will be *Roundness*, and *Nothing round*; *Whiteness*, and *Nothing White*; a *Tast*, and *Nothing tasted*; » Which is ridiculous. pag. 151.

L. It is so, Sr; if *Quantity* be *Nothing*. But *Quantity* according to *Aristotle's* Philosophy is a *Physical Accident* distinct, and by Consequence *separable* from *Substance*; and it is the immediate Subject of the other *Accidents* mention'd by you; which in Reality are but so many different *Modifications* of *Quantity*: And therefore cannot be destitute of their *proper Subject*, whether *Quantity* be join'd to, or *separated* from it's *Substance*; as it is in the *Sacrament* of the *holy Eucharist*.

» G. My Lord, if *Quantity*, and other *Accidents* » subsist by themselves, why are they not *Substances*? » For that is the Definition you give of *Substance*. » pag. 151. 152.

L. Sr, the Reason is, because they do not subsist *naturally* by themselves, as *Substance* do's, but only by a *supernatural Power*.

» G. But if it be by *Miracle*, that they stand by » themselves, then by *Miracle* they are *Substances*, » and there is an End of the Jargon. pag. 152.

L. Sr, I hope there is. For I have already told you,

you, that their *Essence* according to *Aristotle's* Philosophy (which I think you have not yet confuted) is not an *actual Inhesion*, but a *Natural Exigency* of it, which remains when they are *miraculously* separated from their *Substance*. And therefore, good Sr, the *Miracle*, by which they are thus *separated*, do's not convert them into *Substances*.

G. If your Lordship be in earnest about this « *Logick* of *Substance* and *Accidents*, will you lay a « good *Wager* upon it? pag. 153. «

L. *Hudibras* says, *Fools for Arguments lay Wagers*.

G. Yet you have laid all your *Honour* and *Es-
tate* upon it. But are you so sure of it, that you « would take your *Oath* upon it? pag. 153. «

L. Whatever you may fancy, Sr, I do not know that I hazard the *Value* of a *Farthing* upon the *Logical* Question of *Substance* and *Accidents*.

G. That's very strange, My Lord. Is it not a *Point* of *Faith* with you, that the *Accidents* of *Bread* and *Wine* remain after the *Consecration*?

L. It is, Sr; if by *Accidents* you mean the *Signs* or *Appearances* of *Bread* and *Wine*. But whether those *Signs* or *Appearances* be true *Physical Accidents*, or only *Modifications* of the *Object*, or such *Impressions* made upon our outward *Senses* by the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*, as *Bread* and *Wine*, if they had been present, would have made; are meer *School-Questions*, upon which I shall never be disposed to hazard either my *Honour* or *Estate*, much less pawn my *Soul* upon the *Truth* or *Certainty* of them; the *Faith* of the *Church* being not the least concern'd in them.

G. But, My Lord, did you not just now defend *Transubstantiation* by the *Philosophical* Distinction between *Substance* and *Accidents*?

L. But, Sr, do you make no *Difference* between *Building Faith* upon *Philosophy*, and shewing that

the one is not repugnant to the other? I believe all *Mysteries of Faith* purely upon *Divine Revelation*, and not upon their *Non-repugnance* to human Reason, which only shews them to be *possible*. But if a Man be such a Trifler as to muster up Boyish Arguments from *Philosophy* against them, am I not a *Debtor to the Wise and to the Unwise*, and bound to shew that *Christianity* and *Philosophy* are not irreconcilable? And for this Reason I have insisted upon the *Aristotelian* Distinction of *Accidents* and *Substance*: Not that the Mystery of *Transubstantiation* is built upon that *Philosophical* Distinction, or depends upon it, but only to convince you, that it is not repugnant to the *current Principles of Philosophy*.

» G. My Lord, this is that *Philosophy*, and vain
 » Deceit or Fallacy, which the *Apostle* says will spoil
 » or hurt our Faith. Doting upon Questions and Strifes
 » of Words --- perverse Disputings --- and Oppositions of
 » Science falsely so call'd, which some professing have
 » err'd concerning the Faith. Cor. 2. v. 8. 1. Tim. 6.
 » v. 4. 5. 21. 22. pag. 153.

L. Sir, the *Apostle* censures those, who draw Arguments from *Philosophy* to overthrow, or ridicule the sacred Mysteries of *Christian Religion*. So that you have only provided a Scourge for your own Back; and, if you will but consider yourself attentively in the Looking-glass St Paul has set before you, it will discover to you the weak Condition of your Cause. I have proved *Transubstantiation* from *Scriptures*, and the unquestionable *Tradition* of the Church. And what do you oppose against these solid Proofs but Arguments from *human Reason*, the Testimony of our Senses, and poor Trifles of *Philosophy*, which the *Apostle* justly calls, *Doting upon Questions and Strifes of Words*, *perverse Disputings*, and *Opposition of Science falsely so call'd*? These are the Arguments, with which

you attack us; and when we have the Condescension to take Notice of them, and oppose *Philosophy* against *Philosophy* (which indeed is more than you can in Rigour oblige us to in *Controversies of Faith*) you cry out, *that we have nothing but an unintelligible Jargon of Metaphysicks on our Side*. As if *Philosophy* were intended only to run down *Christian Religion*, and it were an Abuse to employ any Part of it in it's Service.

ADVERTISEMENT.

N. B. that the *Gentleman's* whole Reply to the notorious Nonsense, he has made his *Catholic Lord* speak in his *Case stated*, pag. 151. can only be usher'd in by the Nonsense itself which it confutes. This is the Reason, why a great Part of pag. 151. 152. 153. is here omitted. For tho his *Lordship* has now answer'd every Thing, that looks like an Objection in those Pages; it was impossible to repeat Word for Word all the *Gentleman's* fine Drollery contain'd in them without making his *Lordship* personate the Dunce as effectually as he do's in the former Conversation. For he is there made to answer, pag. 151. that *actual Inherence*, or *Insticking* (to render the Farce more ridiculous) is the *Essence of Accidents*. And the *Gentleman* taking the Advantage of his Blunder draws Consequences from it, and plays most unmercifully upon him. If any one has so much Idle Time to throw away, he may read the foremention'd Pages in the *Gentleman's Case stated*. Where he will see how poorly his *Lordship* comes off at last; when weary of being pelted with hard

Words, and unable to resist the Gentleman's powerful *Logick*, he asks Quarter, and begs Leave to believe as the Church believes. To which his triumphant adversary answers in the following Manner.

§. 31.

Of implicit Faith.

» G. CAN you believe what the Church believes,
 » without knowing what she believes? This
 » is Believing Nothing. It is *implicit* indeed! At this
 » Rate you need but one Article of your Creed, to
 » believe the *Holy Catholick Church*: And all the Rest
 » may go off *implicitly*, tho you should know No-
 » thing of any other of the *Articles*. And what a Man
 » knows nothing of, he can give no Reason for. But
 » St Peter bids us *be ready always to give an Answer to*
 » *every Man that asketh us a Reason of the Hope (or*
 » *Faith) that is in us*. Which supposes our Under-
 » standing it ourselves, and not an *implicit* Faith
 » in others of we know not what. So that if you
 » make *Transubstantiation* an Article of your Faith,
 » you are obliged to understand it aright. pag. 154.

L. Sr, I think I do understand it aright; For I know that the *Transubstantiation*, which the Church believes, is a Change of the Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Christ made by the Words of Consecration. And this is as much as I need to know or understand for my Belief of it: And neither you, nor the wisest Man upon Earth knows any more in Proportion of the dark Mysteries of the blessed Trinity, the Incarnation, the Propagation of Original Sin, and such other Articles of Faith, which we both equally believe and profess. Yet I bless God I shall always be

ready to give an Answer to every Man, that asketh me, a Reason of my Faith, or Belief of these Mysteries: And the Answer I am ready to give is, because God has reveal'd them; and the Church, which is the Ground and Pillar of Truth, teaches them. And whoever is not satisfied with this Answer, must bid Adieu to Christianity.

You say, this is Believing with *implicit Faith*. And I say, there is not a Christian in the World, let him be as wise and learned as he will, but is bound to believe innumerable Things with *implicit Faith*. I presume, Sr, you have not the Vanity to pretend to know, much less to understand the whole Bible. Yet I have the Charity to think you believe both all the Facts and doctrinal Truths whether intelligible or unintelligible contain'd in it. Nay you must either do it, or renounce all reveal'd Religion. And what is this but Believing with *implicit Faith*? But suppose any one should have the Vanity to think he knows and understands the whole Bible, yet it is certain there are Thousands amongst Christians, who do not; and are not these bound to believe what they neither know, nor understand of it with an *implicit Faith*? When St Peter said to our Saviour, John 6. v. 68. *Thou hast the Words of eternal Life*: had he not an *implicit Faith* of all the Mysteries of Christian Religion? And is this a Thing to be ridiculed?

You say, at this Rate we need but one Article of our Creed, viz. *to believe the holy Catholick Church*. But I deny your Consequence. Because there are several Articles, all are bound to believe with an *explicit Faith*. As, the *Being of a God*, the *Divinity of Christ*, &c. and therefore early Care is taken to teach Children their Creed, and explain to them all the Articles it contains. But let us hear, what you have still more to say against *Transubstantiation*.

§. 32.

No Danger of Idolatry from the Adoration of Christ in the Eucharist.

» G. **B**UT there is something yet more terrible be-
 » hind. For, if there be no *Transubstantia-*
 » tion, then you worship *Bread and Wine* with *Latria*,
 » by which you mean the *supreme Worship* due to God
 » alone. pag. 155.

L. How Scrupulous are Men sometimes even a-
 gainst their Conscience! But pray Sr, would you be
 so very much frighten'd, if an *Arian* should argue
 thus against the *Divinity* of Christ? *But there is some-*
thing yet more terrible behind: for if Christ be not God,
you are all Idolaters. Sr, we have no different Classes
 of reveal'd Truths as to their Certainty; all being e-
 qually grounded upon *God's Veracity*: and we are as
 certain of the *Revelation* of Christ's real Presence in the
Eucharist, as of the *Divinity* of his Person.

» G. But, My Lord, tho *Transubstantiation* were
 » granted, and fully understood, yet it is impossi-
 » ble for any Man to know whether he worships plain
 » *Bread and Wine*, or the *Body and Blood* of Christ.
 » Because in the *Rubrick* of the *Mass*, *de defectibus*
 » *circa Missam*, there are several Cases put, wherein
 » the *Consecration* is void, and there is no *Sacrament*
 » made, and then there is nothing there but plain
 » *Bread and Wine*. One of these Cases is, if there be a
 » greater Mixture of any other Grain than of *Wheat*
 » in the *Wafer*. Another is, if the *Wine* be made of
 » four Grapes or Grapes not ripe; *si vinum sit ex*
 » *uvīs acerbis vel non maturis*; which is pretty hard
 » to know for the People, who never tast it, or the
 » *Worshippers* who see or tast neither but only a

Pixis, or a *Cup* they look not into : and in both these Cases besides others it is said, *non conficitur Sacramentum*, there is no *Sacrament* made. And so it is said, if the *Intention* of the *Priest* be *Wanting*, which is impossible to know. Upon which Head they put a pleasant Case ; As suppose a *Priest* intends to consecrate *ten Wafers* (for Example) and after Consecration there be found *eleven* or *more* ; then none of them are consecrated, because the *Intention* going only to *ten*, it cannot be known, which these *ten* are. But if there be *Nine* or fewer, they are all consecrated, because the *Intention* going to *ten*, it includes all within that Number. Besides you take it wholly upon Trust, whether there be any *Consecration* at all ; because your *Priests* do not *consecrate* before the People, when they administer the *Sacrament*, but at set Times they *consecrate* Numbers of *Wafers* together, which they reserve for Occasions, and for daily *Worship*. Again it is said in some Cases, *dubium est an conficiatur Sacramentum*. That it is doubtful whether the *Sacrament* be made or not. And what shall we do in this Case ? Is it a *Doubt* whether we worship God or a *Creature* ? Or is it *indifferent* to which we give *Latria* ? pag. 155. 156. "

L. Sr, many of your Observations are wholly frivolous ; but the Sum of all is this, *viç.* that an *unconsecrated Host* may possibly be mistaken for a *consecrated one* ; which is easily granted. And you conclude from it, that they, who *adore Christ* supposing him by Mistake present under that *Host*, are guilty of *Idolatry*, which I deny. For how is it possible a Person intending Nothing else but to *adore Christ*, should commit *Idolatry* whether he will or no ? *Idolatry* is a most grievous *Sin*, and every *Sin* is an *Act* of the *Will* freely consenting to it. Because, tho a

Man may sometimes commit a Sin even against his Inclination out of Compliance, or for Lucre, 'tis a meer *Chimera* to sin against one's Will. And how then can he commit the Sin of *Idolatry*, when his Heart and Will are wholly intent upon *Adoring Christ*, whom he supposes to be really present?

We read *John. 12. v. 21.* that several *Gentiles* came with a Desire to see *Christ*. Now let us suppose, that for want of a Guide to direct them, they had prostrated themselves at the Feet of some other, would any reasonable Man have condemn'd them as guilty of *Idolatry*? Or suppose *St Mary Magdalene*, as she took *Christ* to be the *Gardiner*, *Joh. 2. v. 15.* Had with as much Innocence afterwards taken the *Gardiner* for *Christ*, would this have made her an *Idolater*? I presume your excessive zeal would have pass'd Sentence of Condemnation upon her. But I can never imagine, that a true and ardent Love of *Jesus-Christ* can be the Sin of *Idolatry*.

But let us hear, how an eminent *Protestant Writer* answers this frivolous Objection. I mean *Dr Taylor*: who in his *Liberty of Prophecyng*, Sect. 21. Numb. 26. writes thus. *Idolatry* (says he) is forsaking the true God; and giving Divine Worship to a Creature, or to an Idol, that is, to an imaginary God. Now it is evident, that the Object of their [i. e. the *Papists*] Adoration in the blessed Sacrament, is the only true and eternal God, Hypostatically join'd with his Humanity; which Humanity they believe actually present under the Veil of the sacramental Signs. And, if they thought him not present, they are so far from Worshipping the Bread in this Case, that themselves profess it *Idolatry* to do so. Which is a DEMONSTRATION, that their Soul has nothing in it but what is a great Enemy to *Idolatry*: and nothing burns in Hell, but proper Will. Thus Doctor Taylor, who writes like a fair Adversary, and a Man of Sense.

As

As to the two smart Questions, wherewith you conclude, viz. *Is it a Doubt whether we worship God or a Creature? Or is it indifferent, to which we give Latria?* I answer it is not. Because our *Adoration* is directed wholly and solely to *Jesus-Christ*; who I presume is neither a *pure Creature*, nor an *Idol*.

G. But do you not *adore* the *Host*? And if it be an *unconsecrated* one, do you not then *adore* a *Creature*?

L. Sr, the *Host* implies two Things. *First*, the *Sacramental Signs*, and *2dly*, the *true Body and Blood of Christ*. And therefore, when we are said to *adore* the *Host*, the Meaning is, that we adore *Jesus-Christ* under the *Veil* of the *Sacramental Signs*. But our *Adoration* is not directed to the *Accidents* themselves any more, than the Adoration of *Christ* cloath'd upon Earth was directed to his *Cloaths*. And so there is no Danger of *Idolatry*, tho the *Host*, which the People present suppose *consecrated*, should by Mistake or Malice be an *unconsecrated* one. Because their Act of *Worship* being directed to *Christ alone* supposed to be corporally present and not to *Bread*, their Mistake regards the *Place* alone, and not the *Object*.

ADVERTISEMENT.

His Lordship in the *Gentleman's Case* stated having some Difficulty to get rid of the foregoing Objection, answers (according to his usual Method of Mistaking Things) that in the Supposition of an *unconsecrated Host*, they who adore it are guilty only of *Material*, but not of *formal Idolatry*. To which the *Gentleman* replies in the following Manner.

§. 33.

Of School-distinctions.

» G. **T**Hese *School-distinctions* are meer *Cobwebs*,
 » and will bear no weight. For *Material*
 » *Idolatry* is *Idolatry*, else it were not *Material* *Idola-*
 » *try*. And if our *Intention* will solve it, it will solve
 » it also as to the *Heathens*, who directed their *Wor-*
 » *ship*, and referr'd it ultimately to the *true God*, as
 » has been shewn.

» But I hope you will not make *Salomon* so stu-
 » pid, as you have made the *Heathen*, and to think
 » that he believed *Ashtoreth* the Goddess of the *Si-*
 » *donians*, and *Milchom* the Abomination of the *Am-*
 » *monites*, and the other Gods of the Nations whom
 » he worshipped, to be every one of them the one
 » only *supreme God*. Yet he is charged with *Idolatry*,
 » whether *Material* or *formal* is not the Question;
 » nor is there a **W**ord of it in the *Scriptures*; for
 » *Idolatry* is *Idolatry*, let it be of **W**hat sort it will;
 » and these *Distinctions* are only to excuse it, and
 » let it loose among us.

» The *Arians* were charged with *Idolatry* for **W**or-
 » shipping *Christ* supposing him but a *Creature*: and
 » they were so far from Disowning the true *God*,
 » that it was his Honour they pretended in Denying
 » the *Divinity* of *Christ*. So of the *Socinians*, and our
 » *Unitarians* among us, who give themselves that
 » Name for Supporting the *Unity* of the *Godhead*.
 » Yet they are charged with *Idolatry* for **W**orship-
 » ping *Christ* as an *inferiour God*. And they have the
 » same *Distinction* as you of *Latria* and *Dulia*, a
 » higher and lower Degree of *Worship*. But all
 » *Religious* **W**orship is forbidden to any but to *God*

alone. These *Degrees* of it are of human Invention “
 to excuse your Breach of the Commands of God. “
 But we are to keep far from the forbidden Thing, “
 not try how near we can come to it by *Distinctions* “
 of our own Coyning. We ought to make a *Hedge* “
about the Law, as the Phrase of the Jews was to “
 guard against any Approaches towards the Breach “
 of it. Or in the Apostle’s Words, to abstain from “
all Appearance of Evil. And remember, that you “
 venture your Soul upon these *Distinctions*. Which “
 then are in the safest Way, we who follow the “
Direct Rule of God’s Commandements, as they are “
 plainly laid down to us in holy Scripture without “
turning to the right Hand or to the left, without either “
Adding to them, or *Diminishing from them* as we are “
 commanded Deut. 4. v. 32. Or you who distinguish “
 the plainest Precepts, and make them speak *Meta-* “
physiks? “

By which the Worship of the Devil may be “
 justified : for it is plain, that when he offer’d to “
 our Saviour all the Kingdoms of the World, he meant “
 not that he was the Supreme God and Sovereign “
Disposer. For he said, *that is deliver’d unto me*, and “
to whomsoever I will I give it. Luke 4. v. 6. 8. And “
 it is as plain by the Answer our Saviour gave him, “
thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him alone thou “
shalt serve, that all Sort of Religious Worship was for- “
 bidden to be given to any but to God alone. And St “
Austin makes all to be Devils who require and accept “
 it. *Latria* and *Dulia* signify both the same Thing, “
 that is, *Service*; and here all Religious Service is re- “
 served to God alone. The *Distinction* of the Schools is “
 vain, and meant only to elude the Commands of “
 God, and introduce all Superstition. pag. 156. 157. 158. “

L. Sr, since you are so very sharp upon School-
 distinctions, I shall consider presently, whether you

be not many Times obliged to have recourse to them as well as we. But in the Case we have now before us, to wit, of an *unconsecrated Host*, the Distinction between *formal* and *material Idolatry* is wholly unnecessary. For I deny positively, that in that Case a Person adoring *Christ* (whom he supposes really present under the *sacramental Veils*) commits even *material Idolatry*. Because the *direct Object* of his Adoration is not *Bread* or the *Accidents* of it, but *Jesus-Christ* alone: who being neither a *pure Creature*, nor a *false God*, his Adoration of him is no Idolatry at all either *material* or *formal*, but an Act of divine Worship. Pray remember what *Dr Taylor* has already told us upon this Subject.

However, tho the Distinction of *formal* and *material* be unnecessary, as I have now fully shew'd, in the Case under Debate, what wretched Stuff do you entertain me with, when you tell me, that *material Idolatry is Idolatry*, else it were not *material Idolatry*. Which is just as wisely said, as if a young *Logician* should argue thus, a *dead Man is a Man*, else he were not a *dead Man*. And you add, if our intention will solve it (that is, excuse it from being *Idolatry*) it will also solve it as to the *Heathens*, who directed their Worship, and referr'd it ultimately to the true God. Which is flatly false, tho you confidently add, as you have shew'd: whereas you should only say, as you have endeavour'd and labour'd hard to shew to your *immortal Honour*. For you may as easily prove the Devil to be a *Beauty*, as that the *Heathens* directed their Worship, and referr'd it ultimately to the true God. Your Instance concerning *Salomon* is the widest imaginable from the Purpose. For tho he neither believed *Ashteroth*, nor *Milchom*, nor the other *Heathen Idols*, whom he worshipped, to be true Gods, yet he was certainly guilty not of *material*, but true

and formal *Idolatry*; because his direct Intention (tho' out of Compliance to his Mistresses) was to offer *divine Honour* to their *Idols*; And his Crime was precisely this, that knowing them to be the *Statues of Devils or evil Spirits* he paid them the *supreme Worship*, which is due to God alone.

As to the *Arians, Socinians, and Unitarians* mention'd by you; they may likewise be justly charged with *Idolatry*, if believing *Christ* to be no more than a *pure Creature*, they worship him as *God*; which I never heard they did; But you say, *they come off with the Distinction of Latria and Dulia*: then I am sure they do not worship him as *God*; as I shall prove immediately, by explaining the Meaning of that Distinction.

But let us now see, whether you can stand your Ground against *Socinians, Anabaptists, and Jews* without the Help of *School-distinctions*, which you declaim so bitterly against. Suppose a *Socinian* should prove his Blasphemy against the *Divinity of Christ* from these Words of *St John 15. & 18. My Father is greater than I.* How would you answer him?

G. Very easily, My Lord: for I would tell him those Words are to be understood not with Relation to the *Divine*, but *human Nature of Christ*.

L. Very right Sr. But it seems then that *School-distinctions* are not always meer *Cobwebs*, or *vain Things that will bear no Weight*, but they are sometimes both useful and necessary to support Religion. And pray remember (as you just now exhorted me) that you venture the very Foundation of *Christian Religion*, and your own Soul into the Bargain upon your *Distinction* of the foremention'd plain Words of *Christ*. For if the Distinction be *vain*, you are guilty of *real Idolatry* in *Worshipping Christ as God*. But if Distinctions be *good and legal* in a *Protestant's*

Mouth against *Socinians*, I may modestly say they are equally good and legal in a *Papist's* Mouth against *Protestants*.

G. But, My Lord, do we distinguish the *Commandements*?

L. Sr, to answer this, I have a second Question ready for you. Is not this Precept, *thou shalt not kill*, one of the ten *Commandements*?

G. What then?

L. Why then Sr, all those are guilty of a Breach of this *Commandement*, who kill their Enemies in War. For the *Commandement* is general and absolute: and there is no *Distinction*, or *Limitation* tack'd to it.

G. But, My Lord, all the World understands it of Killing by private Authority.

L. Then all the World must condemn the malicious Nonsense you have talk'd, and own, that the plainest *Commandement* may be distinguish'd, and made to speak *Metaphysicks*, as you call it.

But I have a third Question to ask. Is not *Saturday*, or the 7th Day of the Week meant by the *Sabbath-day* in holy Writ?

G. Yes, My Lord. For God himself says *Deut. 5. v. 13. 14. Six Days shalt thou labour, and do all thy Work, but the seventh Day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. And therefore Saturday is call'd in Latin, dies Sabati, as it is still the Day of Worship amongst the Jews.*

L. Well, and is not this Precept, *thou shalt keep holy the Sabbath-day*, among the *Commandements* of the *Decalogue*? Is it not clear and precise as to the very Day of the Week?

G. Who doubts it?

L. And why then do you keep the *Sunday* instead of *Saturday* holy?

G. My Lord, the *particular Day*, which we call *Saturday*, was only commanded with Relation to the *Jews*, but not to *Christians*, who have therefore changed the *Saturday* into the *Sunday*.

L. What! Still another *Distinction* even of the very *plainest Precept*, and that without the least Foundation in the *Word of God*! Did you not just now tell me, that *such Distinctions* are *meer human Inventions* to excuse our *Breach of the Commands of God*? That we are to *keep far from the forbidden Thing*, not try how near we can come to it by *Distinctions*? That finally we ought to make a *Hedge about the Law*, or in the *Apostles Words* to *abstain from all Appearance of Evil*? Thus you preach'd to me just now with a great Deal of zeal. But pray Sr, what becomes now of all this fine *Cant*? For either the *Commandements* may be *distinguish'd*, or not. If not, how can you defend yourself either against *Anabaptists* Denying the Lawfulness of shedding Blood according to the fifth Commandement, or against the *Jews* insisting upon the expresse Commandement of *keeping the Sabbath*, that is, the *Saturday, Holy*? But if they may, is not all you have said against our *distinguishing* the *Commandements* meer *Pedantick Cavelling*, and *Nonsense*?

Suppose a *Jew* should retort upon you, what you just now laid to me, viz. *Which then are in the safest Way*, we who follow the *direct Rule of God's Commandements* as they are plainly laid down to us in *holy Scripture* without *Turning to the Right Hand or to the Left*, or you who *distinguish the plainest Precepts*, and make them speak *Metaphysiks*? Suppose, I say, a *Jew* should retort this *Canting Stuff* upon you, you must either turn *Jew*, or make him an Answer, which will be a *Cap* to fit your own *Block*. Unless you have this pretty *Salvo* to come off with, viz. that a *Popish Distinction*

of the Commandements is meant only to elude them, and introduce all Superstition, but that Protestants may distinguish them without any such Felonious Intention: And then we shall have a supernumerary *Metaphysical Distinction*, which the *Schoolmen* yet never thought of.

However I perceive the *Popish Distinction* of *Latria* and *Dulia* will by no Means go down with you. But pray Sr, what do you call the *Honour* you pay to *Saints* and *Angels*, when you keep *Holy-Days* in Memory of them? For I am apt to think, this *Distinction*, as *Popish* as it is, will be here full as serviceable to you against the *Dissenters*, as it is to us against the *Church of England*. For, give it what Name you please, if keeping *Holy-days* be any Part of *Christian Devotion*, all the *World* besides yourselves will call it a *Religious Honour*: Because when we honour Persons meerly for *Supernatural Gifts* bestow'd upon them by God, then the *Honour* we pay them is in the common Language of Mankind call'd *Religious*. And, if the *English Word*, *Worship*, be extendable, as it certainly is, to all Sorts of *Religious Honour*, then it follows, that besides the *supreme Religious Worship* call'd *Latria*, which is due to God alone, there is likewise an *Inferiour Religious Worship* call'd *Dulia*, paid to God's *Saints* and *Angels* even by your Church. Which plainly shews, how wretchedly you are out in Saying that *Latria* and *Dulia* signify both the same Thing: And the Consequence of all is, that you are no less out in your main Assertion, viz. That all Sort of *Religious Worship* is forbid to be given to any but to God alone. Unless you will acknowledge, that your own Church is as guilty of Acting contrary to that Pretended Prohibition, as *Papists* themselves. Nay 'tis impossible for you to answer the *Dissenters* but with the Help of that very *Popish Distinction*, or something

thing equivalent to it, which you have taken so much Pains to ridicule.

As to your Saying, that St *Austin* makes all to be *Devils*, who require or accept of any Religious Honour, I am only sorry you put me again in Mind of your Sins past: I mean your *Controversial Sin* of *Falsifying*; which in a Dispute about Religion may be counted amongst the *Deadly* ones; and ought therefore to be repented of and retracted, rather than aggravated by an insulting Repetition.

But the finest Stroke is yet to come, viz. your Saying, that by the Distinction of *Supreme* and *Inferiour* Worship, which we call *Latria* and *Dulia*, the Worship of the Devil may be Justify'd. What Sir! are you in good Earnest, when you talk such extravagant Stuff! May the Devil be worshipp'd with an *Inferiour* or *Relative Honour* as well as the *Friends* and *Servants* of God! This I presume is a Piece of *Divinity*, in which you have not yet many Followers. However, as you have already one *Holyday* for all the *Saints* in general, and another for St *Michael* and all the *Angels*; who knows, but that by your Interest and zeal the *Reformation* of the *Church of England* may be so well improved in Time, that a *Day* may likewise be set apart for *Lucifer* and his *Angels*? For since the one may be justify'd by the other, why should not the Devil have his Due? I am sure the *Religious Honour* you pay to *Saints* and *Angels* in keeping their *Holydays* is justify'd by the Practice of both Churches; and if that will justify our Giving the same *Religious Honour* to the Devil, I see no Reason why according to this new System of *Protestant Divinity* he should not have a *Holyday* allow'd him.

The *Papists* indeed will be highly Scandaliz'd and cry out Shame against it; because they make a large Difference between the faithful *Friends* and *Servants*

of God and his incorrigible mortal Enemy the Devil. They discover in the former the beautiful Supernatural Gifts of Grace and Glory, which entitle them to an *inferiour Religious Honour* for the Sake of him who has bestow'd those Gifts upon them, and to whom that Honour is ultimately referr'd : But they see Nothing in the Devil, which can justify their honouring him in the same Manner.

'Tis true, the Devil was so true to himself (as you have carefully remark'd to do him Justice) as not to pretend to be the *Supreme God* and *Sovereign Disposer* of all Things. But do's it follow from thence, that he may be put upon the Level with God's most faithful Servants, and be honour'd by us as they are ? For Shame Sr, see your Error, and be Sensible to what Extravagances the Prejudice of Education will hurry a Man, that gives himself blindly up to it.

§. 34.

Some Touches of the Gentleman's Skill in Drollery, and Slander.

“ MY Lord, besides the Cases already mention'd by me, there are some unworthy ones put in the Rubrick of the *Maß*; as if a Dog or a Mouse should eat the *Sacrament* --- if a Priest should vomit it up again, in which Case he is to lick it up Reverently, unless it be *nauseous* (that was well put in) and then it is to be disposed of so and so. And again if a Fly should drop into the Cup, how the fly is to be dealt with. --- And one Reason given for taking the Cup from the Laity was, that the Laity (at that Time I suppose) wore long Beards, and least the Blood of Christ should drop upon them or stick to their Whiskers. All

these are the genuine Effects of *Superstition*, occasion'd by the Notion of *Transubstantiation*. p. 159. "

L. Sr, all *Religion* is *Superstition* to those, who have little of it besides the empty Name and Show. However this pleasant Drollery is at least a Testimony, that we are convinced in our *Hearts* of what we profess with our *Tongues*: Since it appears from it, how extremely solicitous we are both to *prevent* Indecencies in the *Administration* of the *Sacrament*, and *remedy* them the best *Way* possible, when they chance to happen.

But let that be as it will, I shall put a Case somewhat like one of the *unworthy* ones you have mention'd. Your *Church-Catechism* teaches, that in the *Lord's Supper* the faithful receive *Verily* and indeed the *Body and Blood of Christ*. Now suppose a sudden Fit of *Vomiting* should take a *Faithful Protestant* in the very Moment he receives the *Sacrament*, I ask whether he may not in that Case vomit up *Verily* and indeed, what he has just then received *Verily* and indeed? And if this should happen, I desire to know what is to be done? If you can propose any Thing more Decent than what is prescribed in the *Rubrick* of the *Maß*, I am very confident your Advice will not be neglected, unless you be for the *licking Part*, of which there is not a *Word* in the *Rubrick*, you refer me to. But this dirty Fiction was necessary to furnish some Matter for a *Jest*.

However I must here desire you to take Notice, that for one *Scurrilous Jest* a *Protestant* can make upon *Transubstantiation*, a *Deist* or *Atheist* disposed to shew his *Wit* that *Way* shall make a thousand upon the *Incarnation* and *Death* of the *Son of God*: And, if *Lampooning* be good *Arguing*, we may soon be laugh'd out of the very *Fundamentals* of *Christianity*.

„ G. But here , My Lord , I must beg Leave to
 „ observe , that the natural Effect of *Superstition* is
 „ *Atheism* and *Deism* ; as one Extreme runs into an-
 „ other like *East* to *West*. For Men of Sense must
 „ find out the Deceit that is in *Superstition* ; and then
 „ Placing all *Religion* on the same Foot (as in your
 „ Communion upon the Authority of your Church)
 „ they must think the whole to be a *Deceit* , or in
 „ the Modish Word *Priest-Craft* , and the Contri-
 „ vance of those who gain by it. Whence it is that
 „ the Holy *Scriptures* and the *Legends* have the same
 „ Foundation in the Church of *Rome* , that is , her
 „ *Authority* : Therefore the common People believe
 „ them both alike , and the Men of Sense believe
 „ neither. And this does so lead towards the General
 „ *Defection* foretold , that in a great Measure it is it.
 „ For it destroys the Foundation of *Religion* , and
 „ turns it all to *Superstition*. And when the *Infidelity*,
 „ which that begets , shall come to be publickly
 „ own'd , then where shall *Faith* be found upon
 „ Earth ? It is now acted in the *opus operatum* : and
 „ instead of the two *Sacraments* which *Christ* has ap-
 „ pointed as *Means of Grace* , the whole Face of your
 „ *Religion* is cover'd with ten thousand of your own
 „ Invention. The unlimited Power taken in your
 „ Church of *Consecrating* every Thing into a *Means*
 „ of *Grace* , your Worship of *Saints* (many of them
 „ *Legendary*) their *Reliques* and *Images* , of *Crosses* and
 „ of the *Host* make up the Bulk of your *Religion* ,
 „ and *Devotions*. pag. 159. 160.

L. And , Sr , the Bulk of this Discourse of yours
 is made up of Slander , and the old thread-bare Non-
 sense of *opus operatum* , *Means of Grace* , *Sacraments*
 of our own Invention , &c. already-repeated twenty
 Times , and as often confuted. [Vide §. 1. 3. 4. 2d
 Part] Fine Stuff indeed for a Man of Sense !

You say, *Faith* is now *acted* in the *opus operatum*. And is not this a pretty Handle for *Atheists* to lay hold of to ridicule the *Sacraments*? Will they not say, that in the Administration of *Baptism* (which I defy you or any Man to explain without the Doctrine of *opus operatum*) *Faith* is only *acted* by *Priests* and *Parsons* as so many *Mountebanks* upon a Stage? I know you are not much concern'd for the *five Sacraments*, we acknowledge more than you, and which by a true *Protestant Figure*, call'd *Slander*, you have multiply'd into *ten Thousand*. But if *Faith* be only *Acted* in the Use of these *Sacraments* and the customary *Benedictions* of the *Church* (of which you also have your Share, as I have shew'd §. 3.) if *Faith* I say be only *acted* in these, will not *Atheists* and *Deists* have a fair Handle to reproach us, that we are likewise no better than *Stage-players* in the Administration of the *two Sacraments* acknowledg'd by you, and other *publick Devotions* of the *Church*? Will they not have Reason to regard all Religion as *Priestcraft*, which you say is now the *modish Word*? But pray, Sr, who brought that scandalous Expression chiefly into Vogue? It was a Member of the *Church of England*, who had so mean an Opinion of the Religion he was then of, and particularly of the Ministers of it, that he scarce ever represented them in his *Writings* but under the most vile and contemptible Characters. But when he became a *Roman Catholick*, for which he lost his Pension of Poet laureate in King *William's* Reign, he used no such prophane Language. Nay he employ'd his Pen in Defence of the Religion he had embraced, and particularly of the *Mystery*, you impugn with so much Bitterness. Which shews, that tho he were acknowledg'd by all to be a Man of excellent Sense, he could see nothing of the *Superstition* you lay to our Charge; nor

find out the *Deceit* or *Priestcraft* you speak of, but in the Religion he had abandon'd : And he was so far from becoming an *Atheist* or *Deist* by the Change, that it purged him effectually of the *Atheistical* Principles he had imbibed, and used to maintain and glory in, whilst he was a Member of your Church.

This leads me to a direct Answer to the first Part of what you spoke last ; where you observe, that the natural Effect of *Superstition* is *Atheism* and *Deism* : and out of the Abundance of your Charity for us, you confidently suppose us to be deeply concern'd in that *Superstition*, whereof *Atheism* and *Deism* is, as you tell us, the natural Effect.

Here then to make your Observation fully answer the Charitable End you drive at, you ought to shew, that profess'd *Atheists* and *Deists* were far more numerous in this Nation *before*, than they have been *since* the *Reformation*. For, if what you commonly call *Popish Superstition* (which is precisely the *pretended Superstition* you speak of) has a natural Tendency to *Atheism* and *Deism*, the undeniable Consequence must be, that During the many hundred Years, wherein that *Superstition* was universally profess'd and practis'd in this Nation, when it had the *Law* on it's Side, and the Authority of all the *Tribunals* both *Civil* and *Ecclesiastick* to support it, the Consequence I say must be, that in those Days of *Popery* *Atheists* and *Deists* must like *Egyptian Locusts* have overspread the whole Land ; whereas it is a noted Fact, that those wild Beasts never appear'd in *Heards*, or *bare-faced* to destroy the *Vineyard*, till the Fences of the *Church* were laid open, and her Authority made *precarious* by the blessed *Reformation*.

Pray, Sr, if the natural Effect of what you call *Popish Superstition* be *Atheism* or *Deism*, will it not follow, that *this Effect* must appear very remarkably in

those of our *Communion* ? Shew me then the profess'd *Atheists* or *Deists* amongst *Roman Catholics*. Shew me from some History , that there was a *Sett* of *Deists* or *Free-thinkers* in *Great-Britain* before it's *Religion* was reform'd ; And then your Observation will be allow'd to have at least some Sense in it. But if you can shew no such Thing, If on the Contrary it be as well known as any Piece of publick News that all the noted *Atheists*, *Deists*, or *Free-thinkers* in *Great-Britain* were either brought up in the *Protestant Communion*, or turn'd *Protestants* to be at full Liberty to turn afterwards what they pleased ; if it be a certain Truth, that the two *Setts* of *Deists* and *Free-thinkers* are of a much later Date than the *Reformation*, and had their grand Lesson of private Judgment in Opposition to *Church-Authority* taught them in *Protestant Schools* ; then give me leave to tell you Sr, that the *Men of Sense*, you appeal to, will be so far from Judging the *Religion* you traduce to be the Source of *Atheism* or *Deism*, that they will certainly Judge your Observation to be as void of Justice, as it is of common Sense.

And what then will they think of the Scandalous Piece that follows ? viz. *That the holy Scriptures and the Legends have the same Foundation in the Church of Rome, that is, her Authority. And that therefore the common People believe them both alike, and our Men of Sense believe neither.* This certainly is a Calumny of so black a Nature, that *Protestants* themselves cannot but be highly scandalized at it. For as to our common People, there is not a Child amongst us that knows his Catechism, but is a living Witness against you, and will tell you he has been taught, that the *Scriptures* were writ by *Divine Inspiration*, and have *Divine Authority* for the Truth of every Thing they contain : But that their Belief of the *Legends*

like that of any *prophane History* is grounded meerly upon *human Authority*; and they are free to *believe* or *disbelieve* them according as their own private Judgment shall direct them. But as to what you add, *that our Men of Sense neither believe Scriptures nor Legends*, I am very confident there is not a Man of Sense or Probity in your own *Church*, but will blush for you, and disclaim any Part in this gross Calumny. So I leave you to account for it at the great Tribunal. I shall say nothing to the Consequence you draw from it relating to the pretended *general Defection*. For Consequences grounded upon barefaced Calumny are sufficiently answer'd by Exposing the Calumny itself.

§. 35.

Transubstantiation as ancient as Christianity.

NOW Sr, to conclude the Subject we have been so long upon, I shall propose an Argument, which appears to me to be a moral Demonstration; that the *Doctrine of Transubstantiation* is as *ancient as Christianity*, and never had a Beginning but from the *Apostles* themselves. I shall explain myself in the clearest Manner I am able; and the first Thing I remark to you is, that if the *Doctrine of Transubstantiation* be a *Novelty*, it is one of the most extraordinary Nature, that ever was broach'd: Both because it is not a meer *Speculative Doctrine*, but the Ground of the most solemn *practical Devotions* of the *Church*; and because it is in itself the most seemingly repugnant to all the *Senses* and *Reason* of Mankind.

G. And what do's your Lordship infer from thence;

L. Sr, I infer from it, *first*, that a *Novelty* of this Nature

Nature could not be brought into the Church without Noise, Disputes, and Troubles; and in a Word, without the greatest Difficulty and Opposition imaginable: because People are not wont to part tamely and quietly with their ancient Faith; especially when a Doctrine the most repugnant in Appearance to Sense and Reason is substituted in Place of it. I infer 2^{dly}, that the exact Time, Manner, and other Circumstances of a Novelty of that importance being brought in, and made an Article of Faith must of Necessity be known by all the learned Part of the World. Whence I infer 3^{dly}, that the Histories of the Time, in which this happen'd, must all be fill'd with particular Relations of the most memorable Events occasion'd by this wonderful Change in the publick Faith of the Church.

Now I have already proved with the utmost Evidence against Dr Cofin, that the Doctrine of Transubstantiation was held both by the Greek and Latin Church in the Eleventh Century, when it was first openly writ against by Berengarius, who was immediately opposed by the ablest Pens of that Time, and condemn'd by eleven Provincial Councils in that very Age; the last whereof defined in express Terms, *that the Bread and Wine, when they are consecrated upon the Altar, are truly and essentially changed into the Body and Blood of our Saviour, and not in Figure only.* Tom. 10. Conc. Lab. pag. 502.

If then the Doctrine of Transubstantiation be not as ancient as the Apostles themselves, but a Novelty invented since their Time, it must have been introduced into the Church in some Age between the Death of the Apostles, and the Eleventh Century. And unless Protestants can prove this Fact from the uncontestable Evidence of as Authentick Histories and Records, as there are (for Example) to prove that England was

converted in some Age between the *Death* of the *Apostles* and the *Eleventh Century*, they labour in vain to persuade any Man of Sense that the *Doctrine* of *Transubstantiation* is a *Novelty* invented since the Time of the *Apostles*.

The Reason hereof is manifest, because all *Changes* in *Religion* are constantly attended with such a Train of remarkable *Circumstances* and *Events*, as cannot possibly escape the Notice of *Historians*; and I can as easily believe the greatest Contradiction in Nature, as that *such Changes* can really happen without being mention'd in the general *Histories* both of the *Times*, which gave Birth to 'em, and of the *Kingdoms*, which were the principal Theatres, on which they were transacted.

Thus we have the *History* of the *Arian*, *Nestorian*, *Eutychian*, and other less considerable *Heresies* transmitted to us by innumerable Hands, which inform us not only of the *Names*, but of the very *Personal Qualities* of the chief Authors of them: of the very *Year* and *Place*, wherein they were first broach'd: Of the *Progress* they made, the *Opposition* they met with, the *Disturbances* they occasion'd, the *Books* that were writ for and against them, the *Councils* that were call'd to condemn them, and other such Particulars, from whence we cannot but form a fix'd Judgment, *first*, that the main Facts contain'd in these *Histories* are no Fictions; and *2dly*, that the *Doctrines* so particulariz'd in every Circumstance relating to them have all the Marks of being *Novelties* brought into the Church since the Time of the *Apostles*.

Now if this be so in Relation to all *Heresies* or *new Doctrines*, that ever were broach'd in the Church: If none of them could ever escape either being detected by the Vigilancy of her Pastors, or recorded in the Writings of those, whose Business it is to in-

struct Posterity in the Transactions of past Ages : If this, I say, be so, then let any one Judge, whether it be possible, that *such a Change* in the *publick Faith* of the *Church* as the introducing of *Transubstantiation* must have made (if it were not *Apostolical Doctrine*) could be compass'd without the same Violent *Struggles*, *Disturbances*, and *Opposition* ! And then I ask, whether it be possible, that *such considerable Events* could be pass'd over in Silence by the Histories of the Times, in which they happen'd ? I take this to be as morally impossible, as that the *Changes* of *Religion* in the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth*, or the *Revolution* under King *James II.* should be wholly omitted by an Historian writing the *Lives* of those two Persons.

This then is the Substance of my Argument in Short. *Transubstantiation* was the *publick Faith* and *Doctrine* of the *Church* in the *Eleventh Century* : Therefore, if it was not taught by the *Apostles* themselves, it was introduced in *some Age* between the *Death* of the *Apostles*, and *that Century*. But a *Novelty* of that extraordinary Nature, and so *repugnant* in Appearance to all the *Senses* and *Reason* of Mankind could not be introduced without Noise, Disputes, and Troubles, and throwing the whole Church into Disorder and Confusion ; and such remarkable Events cannot but be recorded in the Histories of the Times, in which they happen'd ; Therefore if nothing of this appears in any ancient or authentick History, 'tis a moral Demonstration, that they never happen'd at all : and that by Consequence the *Doctrine* of *Transubstantiation* is as ancient as Christianity, and derived from the *Apostles* themselves.

Let us suppose the whole Christian World agree'd now in the Belief that the *Bread* and *Wine* remain unchanged in the *Sacrament*, and that this Be-

lief had been handed down to us from the very Time of the Apostles till now. I ask, *first*, whether it would be possible for any Man in this Case to introduce the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* without being opposed even by some whole National Churches, many Universities, and by numberless Persons both of the prelatick Order and inferiour Clergy? I ask *2^{dly}*, whether this Opposition would not cause great Disturbances and Troubles, and throw the whole Church into the most violent Ferment? And I ask *3^{dly}*, whether such a Revolution in the publick Faith of the Church, in Case it should succeed, could be pass'd over in Silence by all the Writers of the Age, wherein it happen'd? I cannot think there is a rational Man upon Earth, but his Reason and Conscience will tell him, they are all three morally impossible in the Case supposed. And indeed there is no Example of it since the very first Establishment of Christian Religion.

I add, that if *Transubstantiation* be not *Apostolical* Doctrine, it is a most gross and pernicious *Heresy*: and since it is an uncontestable Truth, that it was believed, profess'd, and maintain'd by the universal Church against *Berengarius* in the eleventh Century, if it be an *Heresy*, it must have been invented in some *preceding Age*, by some *particular Heresiarch*, in some *particular Town or Country*; and it must have had a *Name* to distinguish it both from other *Heresies*, and the Orthodox Faith opposite to it.

Here then to give a solid Answer to this Argument, you are bound to shew from some Authentick ancient History all the following Particulars, viz. in *what age* between the *Death* of the *Apostles* and the *Eleventh Century* the *Doctrine of Transubstantiation* was first invented. *Who* was the *first Author* of it. In *what Town or Country* it was first profess'd. (For

all *New Doctrines* must have their *Beginning of Place* as well as *Time*) By *what Name* the Professors of it were distinguish'd from other *Hereticks* , and *what Councils* were call'd to condemn it. Because there never was a *noted Heresy* in the *World* , but was distinguish'd by *some Name* , and condemn'd in some *Council* , or by the *Church Diffusive*. Finally , you must inform me by *what Methods* it made such a prodigious Progress , as to be at length acknowledg'd , profess'd , and maintain'd by the *Universal Church* , as I have fully proved it was in the *Eleventh Century*.

These are the most important Particulars , wherein I demand to be satisfy'd. For Nothing less can suffice to convince any Man of Sense , that the *Doctrine of Transubstantiation* is a *Novelty* invented since the *Time of the Apostles*. Neither must you pretend to flur me off with *precarious Guesses* , *bare Possibilities* , or *imaginary Suppositions* of your own fruitful Invention ; but you must produce *Authentick History* to attest the *Facts* I insist upon , as all Men of Learning can do to witness every Fact of Moment relating to any *noted Heresy* , that ever was in the *World*.

But , if neither you , nor any Body else can undertake this Task without exposing himself to the Laughter of Mankind : If there be no *Ancient History* Extant , in which there appears a fair Account both of the *Beginning* , the *Author* , *Time* , *Place* , and *Progress* of the *Doctrine* in Question , with the most remarkable Events , that attended it till it's full *Establishment* in the *Eleventh Century* , when it was the *publick Faith* both of the *Greek* and *Latin Church* : If , I say , nothing of all this can be found in any *Ancient History* or *Records* , then I repeat once more , what I said before , that such a *universal Silence* relating to a Thing of that Moment is a moral De-

monstration . that the *Doctrin* of *Transubstantiation* never had any other Beginning than from the *Apostles* themselves according to St *Austin's* Rule , which is groundēd upon constant Experience and common Sense , viz. *that when any Doctrin is found generally received in the Visible Church in any Age whatsoever , whereof there is no certain Author or beginning to be found , then it is sure , that such a Doctrin came down from Christ , and his Apostles.* L. 4. de Bapt. C. 6. 24. as also Lib. de Unit. Eccl. C. 19.

Give me Leave , Sr , to illustrate all this from an Example , which will set the whole Matter in the clearest Light. I maintain , that the Doctrin opposite to *Transubstantiation* is an *Heresy*. If you ask me how I prove it to be one ? I answer that I prove it from a full Collection of all such historical Facts as I demand of you to prove that *Transubstantiation* is a *Novelty* or *Heresy*. For I will shew the Doctrin opposite to it to be a *Novelty* brought into the Church many Ages after the Time of the *Apostles* , I will name the chief *Author* of it , the *Time* when , and the *Place* where he first broach'd it ; the *Name* it was distinguish'd by , and finally the *Opposition* it met with in the universal Church.

It was first publickly maintain'd about the Middle of the eleventh Century at *Lions* in *France*. The chief Author of it was one *Berengarius* a Canon of that Place , and his Doctrin was call'd the *Berengarian Heresy*. He had few Followers in those Days , and himself retracted it before he died. Yet it alarm'd the whole Church , and caused very great Disturbances. The ablest Pens were employ'd against it , and it was condemn'd by eleven *Provincial* or *National Councils* before the End of that very Century. And all these Particulars with many more are transmitted to us by all the Ecclesiastical Histories of that Age.

This I think suffices to convince any Man of Sense, that the Doctrine opposite to *Transubstantiation* was regarded as an *Heresy* by the Catholick Church in the eleventh Century, and it follows manifestly from it, that if *Transubstantiation* itself had ever been regarded as an *Heresy* by the Catholick Church in any of the preceding Ages, it must have undergone the same Fate, found the same Opposition, if not greater by Reason of it's seeming Extravagance, caused the same Disturbances, excited the zeal of particular Persons to write against it, and occasion'd the Calling of Councils to condemn it. But since no ancient Ecclesiastical Historian, or other Writer has ever Mention'd any such Thing: Since neither the Person by whom, nor the Place where, nor the Time when it was first broach'd in any of those Ages, nor finally any *Opposition* made to it by the Church in any Age between the Apostles and the eleventh Century was ever recorded in any History, that ever appear'd in the World; I say once more that this is a moral Demonstration, that the Catholick Church has never regarded *Transubstantiation* as a *Novelty* or *Heresy*, but as a Doctrine derived from *Christ*, and his *Apostles*. For it is wholly inconceivable, that the Doctrine opposite to *Transubstantiation* should have been so vigorously oppos'd by the Church, if it were not a *Novelty*; and that *Transubstantiation* itself, if it were a *Novelty*, should never meet with any *Opposition* at all. Now if you please, Sir, you may proceed to some other Subject.

§. 36.

Concerning the Worship of the Cross, and Images of Christ.

» G. **M**Y Lord, not only the *Host*, or *Body* of
 » *Christ* supposed to be corporally in the Sa-
 » crament, but the *Cross* of *Christ*, or any *Effigies* of
 » that *Cross*, and the *Images* of *Christ* are worshipp'd
 » in your Church with the *supreme Divine Adoration*
 » of *Latria*. pag. 160.

L. Sr, that's false, and being extremely injuri-
 ous, 'tis rank *Calumny*: For I defy you to prove
 from any *Catholick Divine*, that we worship the *Cross*
 or *Images* of *Christ* with SUPREME DIVINE ADORA-
 TION.

» G. My Lord, it is taught by a great *Saint* of
 » your Church, whom you call the *Angelical Doctor*,
 » *St Thomas Aquinas*, who says [3. Par. Qu. 2. Art 4.]
 » that *Crux Christi est adoranda Adoratione Latria*. And
 » again: *Crucis Effigies in aliqua alia Materia --- La-*
 » *tria adoranda est*. And in the *Roman Pontifical* it is
 » order'd that in the Procession of the *Emperor* and
 » a *Legate* of the *Pope*, the *Legate's Cross* shall be
 » carried on the Right Hand of the *Emperor's*
 » *Sword*, because *Latria* is due to the *Cross*. pag. 161.
 » 162.

L. Sr, I still insist upon it, that you wrong us;
 because the Words you have quoted, unless they
 be strain'd from the known Sense of the Author, do
 not amount to what you charge us with, viz. that
 we worship the *Cross* or *Images* of *Christ* with SUPREME
 DIVINE ADORATION, as I shall fully prove, when
 you make an End of what you have to say upon that
 Subject.

G. My

G. My Lord, in the *Adoration* of the *Cross* upon *Good-Friday* (which is the principal Part for the Office of that Day) the *Cross* being veiled is discover'd to the People by Degrees; first one *Arm* of the *Cross*, then another, and at last the whole *Cross* is unveiled. And at each Time the Priest says *ecce lignum Crucis, behold the Wood of the Cross*: and the People answer *Adoremus, let us worship*. pag. 161. "

L. But they do not say, *let us worship it with SUPREME DIVINE ADORATION*, nor do they intend it; so go on.

G. And then the Priest first, and afterwards the People come upon their knees, and pay their *Adoration* to the *Cross*. And remember that it is the *Adoration of Latria*, which they give to it. pag. 161. "

L. I remember it, Sr, in *St Thomas's* Sense, which I shall explain presently.

G. Now for *Images*, the same *Aquinas* before mention'd tells us the *Worship* we pay them is *Religionis Cultus*, a *Religious Worship*: And that it is not a different *Latria* which is given to *Christ*, and to his *Images*. *Quod Imaginibus Christi exhibetur Cultus, non diversificatur ratio Latriæ, nec Virtus Religionis*. 2da. 2da. Quest. 81. Art. 3. Resp. ad 3. If then there be but one *Latria*, and the same that is paid to *Christ* and his *Images*, it will justify what *James Naclanius* Bishop of *Clugium* writes in his Exposition of the Epistle to the *Romans* Ch. 1. that the faithful ought not only to worship before the *Image* (as some perhaps out of Caution speak) but to worship the *Image itself* without any Scruple at all; and with the same Sort of *Worship* as the *Prototype*, or whom it represents. And if that is to be worshipp'd with *Latria*, so it's *Image* with *La-*

» *tria* : if with *Dulia*, or *Hyperdulia*, so the Image is
 » to be worshipped with the same *Worship*.

L. Sr, what explains *St Thomas*, will suffice to explain all the rest, who have only follow'd his *Way of Speaking*. But a Man must have a very strong implicit Faith, who can believe that so great a Man (as all the learned *World* allows *St Thomas Aquinas* to have been) was capable of Teaching that *supreme Divine Adoration* is to be paid to a Piece of *Wood* or *Stone*.

G. My Lord, he certainly teaches, that the *Worship of Latria* is to be paid to the *Croß*: But the *Worship of Latria* is *Divine Worship*, therefore he teaches that *Divine Worship* is to be paid to the *Croß*. I think this Argument is conclusive.

L. Sr, the *Worship*, which *St Thomas* calls *Latria*, must according to his true Meaning be consider'd under a double Regard: One to *God* himself, the other to his *Image*. As it regards *God* himself, it is *supreme Divine Adoration*. But as it regards his *Image*, it is no more than an *inferiour relative Honour*, which however terminating ultimately in *God* is for that Reason, as he teaches, a *religious Act* of the same *Kind* or *Species* as the *Act of Worship* which has *God* for it's immediate Object; and therefore he gives it the same Name.

I shall explain myself by an easy Example. There is but one *Theological Virtue* of *Charity*, which is the *Love of God above all Things*. Yet by the same *Virtue* we love our *Neighbour* for *God's Sake*. So that the *Act*, or *Virtue*, by which we thus love our *Neighbour*, has a double *Tendency* or *Respect*: One to our *Neighbour*, who is the *Image of God*; the other to *God* himself, for whose sake we love him. It may therefore be said in *St Thomas's Way of Speaking*, that when we love the *Image of God* in our *Neighbour*, the *Nature* or

Species of the Virtue of Charity is not different from that, by which we love God above all Things.

But would not a Man be grossly Mistaken, who should argue thus from it, that since there is but *one Virtue of Charity*, which is *the love of God above all Things*; therefore, when by *that Virtue* we love our Neighbour, it follows, that we love him *above all Things*, and by consequence pay that *Supreme Love* to the *Image of God*, which is due to *God alone*? For would you not readily answer by telling him, that tho' the *Virtue of Charity*, whereby we love our Neighbour for *God's Sake*, be of the *same Kind or Species* with that, by which we love *God above all Things*, yet since its *Act or Habit* has a *double Tendency*, tis an *inferiour Love*, as it regards the *Image of God*, and only the *Supreme Divine Love of Charity*, as it regards the *Prototype*? Now Sr, apply but this to *St Thomas's* Notion of *Latria*, and you will be Sensible how much you have wrong'd both him, and the whole Body of *Roman Catholicks* by concluding from it, that if there be but *one Latria*, *Supreme Divine Adoration* is given to the *Cross*, and *Images of Christ*. For you may as well argue thus, that if there be but *one Theological Virtue of Charity*, the proper Object whereof is loved above all Things, it follows, that we love our Neighbour *above all Things*, that is, *above God himself*.

Hence it follows, that the whole present Question is in Reality reduced to this trivial Point, *viz.* whether *St Thomas* and his followers express themselves properly? Some think they do; others not. But all (excepting our *Protestant Friends*, who are glad to catch at any Thing to pick a Quarrel) agree, that *St Thomas* means the same as they, who express themselves otherwise: and what assures them of this are his own Words in other Parts of his Writings. Properly (says he) *we don't adore the Cross*.

but only Christ, who is crucified. Hæb. 11. Lect. 5. And again. *It is Idolatry* (says he) *when the honour due to God is given to Images.* ad Coll. 3. Lec. 1. When therefore he says that *Latria* is due to the Cross, he must of Necessity speak of a *relative Latria*, and not of that *Supreme Divine Worship*, which is due to God alone.

G. But what do's your Lordship say concerning your *Adoration of the Cross upon Good-Friday*?

L. I say, Sr, that if the *Word Adoration* be taken, as it is generally by your Church, for *supreme Divine Worship*, we *adore* the Cross no more than you *adore* the Altar when you bow to it. But if it be taken, as we really understand it, for an *inferiour Relative Honour*, nothing but wilful Malice can carp at it.

I desire you then to observe (as Mr Thorndike do's very well. Epil. p. 3. p. 353.) that these Words, viz. *Adoration, Worship, Honour, Respect*, or however you translate the Latin Word, *Cultus*, are or may be equivocal in Spite of our Hearts. That is, sometimes they may signify one Kind of Honour, and sometimes another. Sometimes that which belongs to God, and sometimes that which belongs to Creatures. And the Cause of this Equivocation (says he) is the Want of Words: *Vulgar Use* not having provided Words properly to signify Conceptions, which came not from common Senses: And from this Equivocation in the Words *Adoration, Worship, &c.* the greatest Part of Protestant Objections against the Veneration we pay to Saints and Images arises; and the whole Stress of what you say concerning our *Worship or Adoration of the Cross upon Good Friday*, is grounded upon it.

You know, Sr, our Liturgy is in Latin; and the Latin Word *ADORO*, thô commonly used to signify *Divine Worship*, yet both in the Latin Scripture,

and *Latin Fathers* it frequently signifies no more than an *inferiour Honour*. Thus *St Jerom* says, *ADORAVI praeſepe & incunabula Salvatoris*. *Apol. 2. contra Rufum*. *I have worſhipp'd the Manger and Crib of our Saviour*. And *Tertullian* uſes the ſame Word, when he ſays, *ADORO Scriptura plenitudinem*. *Lib. cont. Herm. C. 22. I reverence the Fulneſſ of Scriptures*. Thus it is likewise ſaid in Scripture, *surrexit Abraham, & ADORAVIT populum terra*. *Gen. 23. v. 7. Which you tranſlate, Abraham ſtood up, and bow'd himſelf to the People of the Land*. And again, *filii Prophetarum venientes in occurſum Eliſæi ADORAVERUNT eum*. *4. Reg. 2. v. 15. is tranſlated thus in your Bible. The Sons of the Prophets came to meet Elisha, and bow'd themſelves to the Ground before him*. And (to omit innumerable other Paſſages of the ſame Sort) that of *Pſalm 98. v. 5. ADORATE Scabellum pedum ejus*, is likewise thus tranſlated by you, *fall down before the Footſtool of God*.

Now theſe are ſufficient Inſtances to ſhew, that the *Latin Word ADORO* frequently ſignifies no more, than an *inferiour Honour*; ſince it is manifeſt, that in the Paſſages I have quoted both from *Scriptures* and *Fathers* it can have no other Signification. And in Effect it ſignifies no more in our *Office on Good-Fryday*; And ſo your Objection againſt it is meer Froth, unleſs you can prove more effectually than you have done hitherto, that even an *inferiour Relative Honour* is too much to be given to the *Croſs* or *Images of Chriſt*: Tho the very *Jews* were commanded to give it to the *Footſtool of God*, that is, the *Ark*.

Pray, Sr, when you make a Bow, and your Women a low Courteſy to the venerable Name of Jeſus, as is appointed by your Church, what is the Meaning of it? I preſume you do not pay that Reſpect

either to the *Sound*, or to the *Syllables* or *Letters* of that *Word*; But the Ground of the *Respect* and *Honour* you pay to it is the *Relation* it has to the *Divine Person*, who bears that *Name*. And then I should be glad to know what *Difference* there is between your *Bowing* to his *Name*, and our *Kneeling* to the *Cross*, whereon he died! Nay suppose it were a Custom both for Men and Women to *Kneel down* as often as they heard the *Name of Jesus* pronounced, it would be no more than what *St Paul* encourages us to do when he tells us, *that God has given him a Name, which is above every Name, that at the Name of Jesus every knee shall bow*. Philip. 2. v. 9. 10.

I know that *Dr Stillingfleet* (of whom you have borrow'd all your fine Arguments to prove us *Idolaters*) to get rid of this troublesome Parallel between the *Protestant Bows* or *Court'sies* to the *Name of Jesus*, and our *Kneeling* to the *Cross* answers, *that we might as well instance in Going to Church at the Toll of a Bell, as in Bowing at the Name of Jesus: For, as the one only tells us the Time when, so the other only puts us in Mind of the Person whom we are to Worship*. So that according to this learned *Protestant Doctor* no more Reverence is paid to the most holy *Name of Jesus*, when we hear it pronounced, than to a *Bell* when we hear it toll. Most shamefull Doctrine! And how different from the *Text*, I have just now quoted from *St Paul*! I heartily wish the Doctor may not have his Portion with the *Heathen Jupiter*, for whose Honour he was so zealous in this Life.

But let that be as it will, unless you can shew a *Substantial Difference* between *Bowing* or *Making low Court'sies* to the *Name of Jesus*, and *Kneeling* to the *Cross*, you will never avoid being guilty of a manifest *Incoherency* in *Practising* the one, and *condemning* the other. For *Kneeling* is an Action as *indifferent* in

itself as *Bowing*. Both are in proper Circumstances made Use of to testify our *Respect* either to *God* or his *Creatures*; and the *Nature* or *Quality* of the *Respect*, we shew by those *Actions*, are chiefly diversified by the *Intention* of the *Will*. So that if *Bowing* to the *Name* of *Jesus* be no more than an *inferiour Relative Honour*, which terminates wholly in *Christ* himself, *Kneeling* to and *Kissing* the *Cross* are likewise no more. And if this be properly call'd *Worshipping* the *Cross*, the other is as properly call'd *Worshipping* the *Name* of *Jesus*: Or call it by what *Name* you please, provided you give the *same Name* to both.

§. 37.

Some Touches of prophane Burlesque.

6. **M**Y Lord, there is another strange *Latria* paid to the *preputium* of *Christ*, or the *Fore-skin*, that was cut off at his *Circumcision*. Your *Doctors* are at great Pains to know what is become of it. They might as well ask what is become of the *Pairings* of his *Nails*. Whither will *Superstition* run? They had it at *Antwerp*; but the *Hereticks* took it away. From thence it travell'd by many *Miracles* to the *Church* of *St John Lateran* at *Rome*. And how it was thence translated to the *Church* of *Cornelius* and *Cyprian* at *Calcata* about twenty Miles from *Rome*, I have read at large the Account in a Book in *Folio* intituled *de Basilica & Patriarchio Lateranensi ad Alex. VII. Pont. Max.* Authore *Cesare Raspono ejusdem Basilica Canonico.* Romæ 1656. p. 364. &c. And of the *miraculous* Difference it shew'd, when it was touch'd by *Virgins* and by *Marr'd Women*, see the *Devotions* of the

» *Roman Church*, pag. 31. Where you will find other
 » Authors quoted, as *Bolandus*, *Act. Sanct. ad Jan. 1.*
 » *de praputio Christi*. And *Rivet: Apologia pro Sancta*
 » *Maria Virgine*. Lib. 1. C. 17. Cardinal *Tolet*: in
 » *Caput 2. Luca*, *Annot. 31.* And *Salmeron in Evang.*
 » *Tom. 3. Tract. 36.* And that tho it is still at *Cal-*
 » *cata*, yet it is carried about at *Podium* with great
 » Veneration upon the Feast of the *Ascension*. *Sal-*
 » *meron* in the Place above quoted tells us out of the
 » *Legend of Jacobus de Voragine*, that the *Blessed Vir-*
 » *gin* gave this *Praputium* first to *Mary Magdalen*,
 » and that it was brought afterwards by an *Angel* to
 » *Charles the Great at Aken*, and how after it came
 » to be laid up in the *Lateran*; whence these Verses:

» *Circumcisa Caro Christi, Sandalia Sacra,*

» *Atque Umbilici viget hic Præcisio chara.*

» Put thus into English.

» *Christ's Fore-skin, and blessed Sandals are kept here,*

» *And what was cut from off his Navel dear.*

» I suppose they meant the Cutting of his *Navel-*
 » *string*. And his *Sandals* (tho it is not said that he
 » wore any; for he is always painted bare-foot)
 » will come in here too for *Latria*, for the same
 » Reason, which *Thom. Aquinas* gives for *Latria* as
 » due to the *Croß propter Membrorum Christi contac-*
 » *tum*, because it touch'd the *Body of Christ*. Then
 » all his *Cloaths* must come in for the same Reason,
 » and the *Nails* and *Spear* that pierced him. And why
 » not the *Spittle* that was thrown in his Face? For
 » the *Croß* was as much his *Enemy* (as far as *Wood*
 » could be) as any of the other, or the *Spittle* it-
 » self. And I know not why the *Crucifiers* should not
 » be admitted too, tho they touch'd him with an
 » *Hostile Mind*: as some have Sainted *Judas*, because
 he

he was an Instrument in our Redemption. For there "is no Stop in *Superstition* more than in other *Arts*." pag. 162. 163. 164. "

L. Sr, Buffoonery ought at least to have it's Bounds, and keep at a respectful Distance from every Thing belonging to the *sacred Person* of *Christ*. So far ought we to be from Making any Thing relating to him the Subject of *Burlesque*. What a Number of Questions as *undecent* as *prophane* might not an *Atheist* or *Deist* start concerning our Saviour's *Circumcision* and *Passion*. And would you think them worth a serious Answer? Now, Sr, the *Legendary* Stuff you have rehearsed concerning our Saviours *Foreskin* is as impertinent as those Questions would be, and 'tis a Subject not fit to be jested with. And therefore when any of our Authors write of it, let their Relations be as fabulous as you please (for that is beneath my Concern) they observe at least a *Decorum*, and speak not of it like *Jack-puddings* in *Bartholomy-faire*, or in the *Ribaldry-Style* of *Merry Andrews* to make Sport for *Libertines* and *Atheists*.

But as to that *undecent Piece*, for which you quote the *Devotions of the Roman Church*, I am not surpriz'd at any Sort of *Filth* coming from that *Sink* of *Forgeries* and *Scandals*. 'Tis a meer *common Sewer*, into which the Author has convey'd all the *Dirt*, he has with infinite Labour raked together to throw at us.

However one short Answer to all the fine Stories that Author has told, and those you have now entertain'd me with, is, that when you find any of them either in the *Decrees of our Councils*, or *Catechisms*, or *Professions of Faith*, or when we insist upon them as *Terms of Communion*, then we are Responsible for them, and not otherwise. So that Telling *Old Wives Stories*, or the indiscret Disputes or fabu-

lous Relations of *particular Persons* to ridicule any *Church* is *beneath* a grave *Divine*, and betrays not only a Dearth of solid Arguments, but a Mistrust of his Cause: since he is forced to have Recourse to such vile Means to support it.

As to the *Latria*, which you run so much Discant upon, I have already sufficiently explain'd *St Thomas's* Meaning of that Word, and how it may be applied to the Things you make yourself merry with. But this I assure you, that had I a Handkerchief, which had wiped off the *Spittle* from our *Saviour's Face*, or the *Nails* that pierced his *sacred Hands* and *Feet*, I should keep them with a singular Veneration, and as a most *precious Relique* in Remembrance of him: and so I would the least *Scrap* of his *Cloaths*: Nor should any *prophane Buffoon* ever make me alter my Mind. How common a Custom is it to keep a *Lock* of a Person's *Hair*, whose Memory is Dear to us, or even a *Toy* that but belong'd to him? And, if this Practice be grounded upon an *inbred Impression* of *Nature*, and is not thought absurd in *common Life*, why should it be a *Superstition* in Religion to have a Veneration for Things, that have any *Ways* belong'd to our *Divine Redeemer*?

The *Woman*, that was troubled with the *bloody Flux*, had a firm Faith, that if she could but touch the *Hem* of his *Garment*, she should certainly be cured. Now, if the *Apostles* had been *Protestants* in their *Principles*, they would have upbraided her with *Superstition*. And how much more would *St Peter* have condemn'd those, that crouded to come within the Reach of his *Shadow*, and *St Paul* those *Zealous Devotes*, that brought their *Aprons* and *Handkerchiefs* to touch his *Body*? But in those early Days of *Christianity* Men had a *Religious Respect* for Things, that but touch'd the *Body* of a faithful *Servant of Christ*.

Believe me, Sr, they were not in those Days a Subject of *Mirth* and *Laughter*: That Sort of *Wit* is a Fruit of a later Growth, and was brought into Credit by the blessed *Reformation*. Before which Time I find that Men were also so stupidly *Superstitious*, as to make a Difference between the *Dead Instruments* of our *Saviour's Passion*, all which they held in Veneration, and his *Crucifiers*, whose *Cruelty* and *Malice* they detested: Tho' your more elevated Genius cannot stoop low enough to make these Vulgar Distinctions between *Things* and *Things*, or between *Things* and *Persons*.

All the *World* knows what honours *Antiquity* paid to the *Cross* of *Christ* on Account of it's being the *Instrument* of our *Redemption*: and with what Solemnity *St Helena* the Ancient Glory of *Britain* placed it again upon *Mount Calvary*, after it had distinguish'd itself from the *two Crosses* found with it under Ground by the *miraculous Cure* of a *Woman* afflicted with a grievous Distemper: And how being afterwards carried away by *Chosroas* King of *Persia*, was fourteen Years after again recover'd by the Emperor *Heraclius*, who refused to make Peace with the *Persians*, but upon Condition, that they should restore the *Cross*; which himself carried on his Shoulders with great Pomp to the Place, where *Christ* had suffer'd upon it; and the like Honour was in those Days paid to the *Nails*, which fasten'd him to it. But I never heard of any Honours paid by the *Ancient Church* to his *Crucifiers*. Which shews, they plainly saw a Difference, where you pretend to see none, viz. between the *Dead Instruments* of our *Saviour's Passion*, and the *Criminal Actors* in it. But some *Ornamental Strokes* of *Buffoonery* are absolutely Necessary to make *Falsehood* go down, and supply the *Deficiencies* of solid Reason.

» G. But, My Lord, I must not forget my Friends
 » the *Schoolmen* upon the occasion I have spoken of.
 » They dispute, that the *Foreskin* being of the *Entireness* of the *Body*, it must have been reunited to
 » the *Body* of *Christ* upon his *Resurrection*, else that
 » the entire *Body* did not arise. *Suarez* therefore concludes, that the *Body* of *Christ* at the *Resurrection*
 » had a *Foreskin*, which is shew'd in the *Church* here
 » below. He says, that the *Foreskin* belongs to the
 » *Entireness* of the *Body* *non formaliter sed materialiter*, not formally but only *Materially*, and so the
 » Business is made up. But he adds, that *Innocent*
 » III. did call in Question this *Foreskin* upon Earth.
 » It is a Question then. And do the People still pay
 » *Latria* to it? How comes this to be suffer'd in the
 » *Church*? In the *Church*, that is *Infallible*! pag. 164.
 » 165.

L. And I ask you, Sr, Whether the Church's *Infallibility* obliges her to interpose her Authority in all the trivial Questions, which *Divines* dispute *pro* and *con* against one another? You are sometimes very angry at her for *Pronouncing decisively* in Matters, where she is sure she has *Authority* to do it; and now you quarrel with her for not Doing it in Matters, wherein she Judges her *Authority* not to be concern'd. So that whether full or fasting, you are equally displeas'd.

All then that the *Church* suffers is, that they who are convinced in their Hearts, that there is *such* or *such a Relique* of our *Saviour* upon Earth, may give it the *Respect* that is due to it; call it by what *Name* you please: which surely cannot be an Argument against her *Infallibility*; unless you make this a good Consequence, *The Church acts prudently, therefore she is not infallible.*

» G. But, My Lord, several Parcels of the *Blood*

of *Christ* shed upon the *Cross* are likewise shew'd ;
 and *Cressy* quotes *Math. Paris* for a signal Testi-
 mony of it. To this , says *Aquinas* , whatever be-
 longs to the Nature of an humane Body was wholly in
 the Body of *Christ* when he rose , as his Flesh and Bones
 and his Blood , and that entirely without any Diminu-
 tion ; otherwise (says he) it had not been a perfect
Resurrection. And afterwards , that all the Blood ,
 which flow'd from the Body of *Christ* , rose again
 in his Body. But as for that Blood (says he) which
 is preserved in some Churches for Reliques , it did not
 flow from *Christ's* Side , but is said to have flow'd mi-
 raculously from a certain Image of *Christ* , that was pier-
 ced. Yet the People pay Latria to it grounded
 wholly upon a Legend : And *Aquinas* gives no fur-
 ther Assurance of it , than that it was said. Is this
 Worshipping in Faith ! What Blood was that
 which came out of an Image ? Was it *Christ's* Blood ?
 And how was it made so ? Was it transubstantiated ,
 or was it Blood Materially tho not formally ? Or
 had it only the Colour of Blood , the Accidents re-
 maining without Substance ? *Vasquez* comes pretty
 near this when he says , that no Portion of the Blood
 of *Christ* did remain on Earth under the Form of Blood ,
 but only under it's Colour , *amissa forma Sanguinis* ,
 having lost the Form of Blood. pag. 165. 166. "

L. Sr , I am wholly of *St Thomas Aquinas's* Mind ,
 that *Christ* at his *Resurrection* resumed every Thing
 requisite to the Integrity of a Human Body , As by
 God's infinite Power every Man will do at the gene-
 ral *Resurrection*. And I am likewise so far of *Vas-*
quez's Mind , viz. that there is no Blood of *Christ* up-
 on earth but that , which we receive in the Sacra-
 ment of the holy *Eucharist*. So that , if the Fact be
 true (for neither you nor I are bound to believe it)
 that God , to confound the sacrilegious Impiety of those

who pierced an *Image* of *Christ* in Derision or Hatred of him, manifested his displeasure in the *Miraculous* Manner as is commonly related; what appears to me most probable is, that it was *real Blood* indeed, but not the *Blood* of *Christ* that issued from it: Which utterly spoils the jest of all your fine Questions. For I find no more Necessity either for the *Distinction* of *Material* and *Formal*, or for *Transubstantiation*, or *Accidents* remaining without their *Substance* in the above-mention'd *Miracle*, than in the *miraculous Flowing* of *Water* from the *Rock*, when *Moses* struck it with his *Rod*: Because the same *Power*, that produced *Water* out of a *Rock*, can surely produce *Blood* out of an *Image* of *Wood*. And in such a Case the same Sort of *Respect* is due to the *Blood* produced in that *miraculous* Manner, as to the *Crucifix*, from which it *flows*; because as the one is an *Image* of *Christ Dying*, so is the other of his *Shedding his Blood* on the *Cross*.

ADVERTISEMENT.

The Gentleman in his Case stated having a Great Itching to make a witty jest upon Aristotle's Principle of Privation; in Order to usher it in decently and with Connection, makes his Lordship ask this wise Question. What is this Matter and Form, with which they keep such a Stir? To which the Gentleman answers as follows.

“ G. THEY make three constituting Principles in
 “ every Thing. These they call *Materia*,
 “ *Forma*, & *Privatio*. That is, the *Matter*, of which
 “ any Thing is made. The *Form*, which is wholly
 “ unknown to us. And the *Want* of that *Form*. For

you must know, that we must want a Thing before we have it. pag. 166. "

L. Sr, it is no small Oversight in a Pretender to *Logick* to tell me, that *Privation* is one of *Aristotle's* CONSTITUENT Principles; which suffices to answer this idle *Jargon*.

G. Yet your Article of *Transubstantiation* is nothing else, as I hope I have made it plain. And I will shew you another Instance, wherein you follow the *Schoolmen* too, and are grossly misled by them: that is, the *Distinction of Concomitancy*. pag. 166. "

L. Sr, you have made it just as plain, that *Transubstantiation* is a meer *Jargon*, as you have made it plain, that the *Heathen Jupiter* is the true *supreme God* adored by *Christians*: and as you have made it plain, that our *Men of Sense* believe neither *Scriptures* nor *Legends*. Truly Sr, if Asserting *Falsehoods* boldly be making Things plain, you have done great Feats in this Conversation. But I must tell you plainly, you are in a bad Way at present, unless you succeed better than you have done hitherto, in making it plain that the *Distinction of Concomitancy* is a Meer *Jargon*. Let us then hear, what you have to say for yourself.

G. I have before told you of several Injuries done to our *Lord Christ* in Adding to his *Commandments*, and making to yourselves *Means of Grace*, which he has not instituted. pag. 166. "

L. And I have before made it plain to a Demonstration [part. 2. §. 3. §. 33.] that you have even contradicted the Practice of your own Church, upon both those Heads.

§. 38.

Of Concomitancy, and Communion under one Kind.

» G. **W**Hat I am to speak of now is an Error
 » on the other Hand, that is, of *sub-*
 » *stracting* from his *Institutions*, and the *Means* of
 » *Grace*, which he has appointed. I mean in Taking
 » away the *Cup* from the *Laity* in the holy *Sacrament*.
 » *Christ* instituted the *Sacrament* of his *Body* and *Blood*
 » as an effectual *Means* of *Grace*, calling it the *Com-*
 » *munion* of his *Body* and *Blood*. Particularly of the
 » *Cup* it is said, *The Cup of Blessing*, which we bless,
 » is it not the *Communion* of the *Blood* of *Christ*. 1. Cor.
 » 10. v. 16. And that we all partake of the *Cup* ac-
 » cording to several Manuscripts of your own *Vulgar*
 » *Latin*. *Omnes de uno pane, & de uno Calice partici-*
 » *pamus*. But that the *Laity* might not think them-
 » selves deprived of this so beneficial a *Means* of
 » the greatest *Grace*, the *Schools* have invented a
 » *Distinction* they call *Concomitancy*, which is, that in
 » all *Flesh* there is some *Blood* goes along, or is *con-*
 » *comitant* with it. So that whoever eat the *Flesh*,
 » partake also of the *Blood*. pag. 167.

L. Really Sr, I wish you had studied our Divi-
 nity a little better. What! do we say, that in all
Flesh there is some *Blood* go's along with it! And is this
 the Meaning of our Doctrine of *Concomitancy*? I can-
 not but pity your real or affected Ignorance. But
 that you may be better instructed for the future,
 what our Divines teach is this, to Wit, that nei-
 ther a living *Body* can be without *Blood*, nor the *Blood*
 of a living incorruptible *Body* without the *Body* itself.
 And therefore when the *Laity* receive the living *Body*
 of *christ* under the *Form* of *Bread*, they must by
 Conse-

Consequence also receive his *sacred Blood*, which is inseparable from it : and so it is truly call'd the *Communion of his Body and Blood* : nor are they by Consequence *deprived* of any Part of the *Sacrament*, or of the *Grace* it contains. This *Sr*, is our Meaning of the *Distinction of Concomitancy*, which is so far from being a *Jargon*, that it is plain *common Sense*.

You say, of the *Cup* it is particularly said by *St Paul*, the *Cup of Blessing* which we *bleß*, is it not the *Communion of the Blood of Christ*? 1. Cor. 10. v. 16. Who doubts it? And in the same Verse it is as particularly said; *And the Bread* which we *break* is it not the *Communion of the Body of our Lord*? Now I presume *St Paul* do's not speak of a *Dead* but a *living Body*, which is necessarily composed of *Flesh* and *Blood*. Nor can any Man have such a gross Imagination as to think the *Blood* is really separated from the *Body* in the *Cup*; or the *Body* from the *Blood* in the *Host*.

We may likewise modestly presume that *St Paul* was no Equivocator, but call'd Things by their own Names. And therefore when he said, *that the Bread and Cup being blessed are the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ*, he could not mean that they continued to be plain *Bread* and *Wine* after the Consecration. And so his Words are a full Confutation of this impious Error.

ADVERTISEMENT.

Instead of the Answer now given, his Lordship, in the former Conversation takes all for Current Coin, and only asks this modest Question; And is not that true? To which the Gentleman's Reply is so exorbitantly weak, that the Reader will be surpriz'd at it. However he must
II. Part.

take it for Better or for Worse. His Lordship therefore having put this Question, And is not that true? The Gentleman answers as follows.

» G. Really, My Lord, I know not. But I am
» sure it is a *Nicety*. For *Flesh* may be so dried, that
» no *Blood* shall appear in it; and in a *Wafer* there
» can be none without having Recourse to a *Mira-*
» cle. pag. 167.

L. But I hope, Dear Sr, there may at least be some in the *living Body* of *Christ*, which the faithful receive *verily* and *indeed* in the Lord's Supper. Unless you will say, that they receive a *Dead Body* under the *Form* of *Bread*, and *Dead* or *inanimate Blood* under the *Form* of *Wine*: which is both impious and absurd.

» G. I think, My Lord, it is making too bold to
» throw off the *Institution* of *Christ* upon such Ima-
» ginations of our own, which imply that there
» was no need of the *Institution* of the *Cup*. For if
» it be not necessary now, it was not so then. pag.
» 167.

L. Sr, it is not only *Making too bold* (for that is too soft a Term) but *wicked* and *Sacrilegious* to throw off the *Institution* of *Christ* upon any Imagination whatsoever. But do we throw off the *Institution* of *Christ*, because we teach that a *living Body* cannot be without *Blood*, nor the *Blood* of a *living Person* be separated from his *Body*? And that by Consequence we receive *whole Christ*, whether we receive him under *one* or *both Kinds*?

G. But do's not this make the *Institution* of the *Cup* unnecessary?

L. No Sr, it do's not. Because the *Eucharist* is not only a *Sacrament*, that is, a *Sign of invisible Grace* instituted for the Nourishment of our Souls; but also

a *Sacrifice*, which is one of the most essential Parts of Religion. And for this Reason *Christ* instituted the *blessed Eucharist* under *both Kinds*, that by the *Mystical Separation* of his *Body* and *Blood* upon the *Altar* their *real Separation* on the *Cross* might be more perfectly represented, and so be both a standing lively *Memorial* of the *Death* he once suffer'd, and a perpetual *Oblation* of infinite Value for us. But many of the *Reformation* have effectually rob'd the People of this *whole Sacrifice* and all it's Fruit by Denying the *real Presence* of *Christ* as a *Victim* under the *Sacramental Signs*, and had no other Way to cover the Impiety of this Fact than by Raising a Clamour about the *Cup*, as if without it the People received a *mangled* and *imperfect Sacrament*: whereas nothing is more false; because by Receiving the *Living Body* of *Christ* they are made as much Partakers of his *sacred Blood*, as if they received it under *both Kinds*.

G. But, My Lord, this *Sacrament* was ordained not only to express the *Death* of *Christ*, but also the Manner of it: that is, by the *Shedding* of his *Blood* according to the *Bloody Types* of him under the *Law*, as it is said, *without Shedding of Blood there is no Remission*. Hæb. 9. v. 22. *It was therefore necessary*, says the Apostle. But whatever *Blood* may be *concomitant* in the *Flesh*, yet there is no *Shedding* of it express'd in a *Wafer*. pag. 168. "

L. Sr, not in a *Wafer* remaining *true Bread* after, as it was before the *Consecration*. But if the *Bread* and *Wine* be by the *Words* of *Christ* converted into his *sacred Body* and *Blood* (as they most certainly are, unless you can prove *Christ* to be an *Equivocator* or *Liar*) the separate *Consecration* of them, which belongs to *Priests* alone, is the most lively Expression both of his *Death* and the *Man-*

ner of it : that is , by the *mystical Shedding of his Blood*. But if neither the *Bread* be by Consecration converted into his *Body*, nor the *Wine* into his *Blood*, I should be glad to know , how *this Shedding of his Blood according to the bloody Types of him under the Law* can be express'd by it. And I leave every Man to Judge , whether he who talks of nothing but the *Flesh and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament* , and believes nothing conformably to the natural and obvious *Meaning of his Words* , be not guilty of damnable Hypocrisy and Dissimulation ?

» G. But, My Lord, when the *Host* is carried in
» Procession , as upon *Corpus Christi Day* or fre-
» quently to the Sick , there is no *Cup* , nor do's
» the Priest himself communicate. But however if
» the People are to partake of the Sacrifice as it
» was under the Law , here they are defrauded of
» one Half of it. pag. 168.

L. But Sr, when the *Host* is carried in Procession or to the Sick , it either is *Christ's Body* or not. If not , then neither is the *Cup* his *Blood*. And so according to this *Protestant System* your People are downright bubbled ; imagining they receive both *Christ's Body and Blood* , when in Effect they receive neither. But if the *Host* be *Christ's real Body* , I am sure it is not a *dead one* ; nor are they by Consequence , who receive it , defrauded of *one Half* either of the *Sacrament* or *Sacrifice*. Pray would the People under the *Old Law* have been defrauded of *half the Sacrifice* , in Case the whole Victim had been given to all , and to every particular Person ? Now tho this be an impossible Supposition in Reference to the *Sacrifices of the Mosaick Law* , 'tis literally true in Reference to the *Christian Sacrifice*. For the whole *Victim* , I mean , the *entire Body and Blood of Christ* is given to every Christian Communicant , in what,

ever Manner he receives it, that is, whether by the *Action of Eating, or Drinking*. For *Christ* in his *impassible and immortal State* cannot be divided, and we either receive *whole Christ*, or nothing of him. So that whoever receives his *sacred Body* receives his *Blood*: And whoever receives his *sacred Blood*, receives his *Body*: For he neither receives *Dead Flesh*, nor *Dead or inanimate Blood*. And this is what we call *Concomitancy*. And by Consequence it is not only Calumny, but rank Nonsense to say the People are defrauded of *one Half* of the *Sacrament*.

G. My Lord, the People are as much commanded to partake of the *Cup* as of the *Bread*. And the *Church* may as well take away the *Bread*, and leave only the *Cup* and say, that the *Flesh* is contained in the *Blood*, as well as the *Blood* in the *Flesh*. Strange Power of the *Church*! What *Institution* of *God* can stand at this Rate? Suppose the *Jews* had neglected to pour out or Sprinkle the *Blood* of the *Sacrifices* as commanded, and said it was sufficient that it was by *Concomitancy* in the *Flesh*, would this *Distinction* have Served in that Case? And why not as well as in this? pag. 168. 169. "

L. Sr, if the *Jews* had neglected to pour out or sprinkle the *Blood* as commanded, they would have been guilty of a grievous Sin in Disobeying the express command of *God*: nor could the Pretence of *Concomitancy* have in any Manner palliated their Disobedience: nay it would have been ridiculous in the highest Degree; because it is impossible that the *Blood* of a Victim really shed (as it was by the *Priests* of the old Law) should at the same Time remain in the Victim: but it is absolutely necessary that the *Blood* of *Christ*, which is only shed *Mystically* by the *Priests* of the new Law, should remain really united to his *Body*. The Consequence whereof is, that the

People receiving his *living Body* receive his sacred Blood *concomitantly*: Which shews your Parity to be entirely void of Sense. For it implies two Parts equally absurd. *First*, that as the Blood was not by *Concomitancy* in the *dead Victims* of the Law, so neither is it by *Concomitancy* in the *living Body* of Christ. And *2dly*, that as the *Jewish Priests* were bound to pour out or sprinkle the Blood of the Sacrifices, so the Priests of the new Law are bound to give the *Cup* to the People. And is not this fine Stuff?

There are indeed two Parities that may be fairly made; for they contain two solid Truths. The *first* is, that as the Priests of the *old Law* would have been guilty of a grievous Disobedience, if they had neglected to shed the Blood of the Victim *really* under Pretence of *Concomitancy* in the Flesh, so the Priests of the *new Law* would incur the like Guilt, if in celebrating the Mysteries they should by not consecrating the Wine separately neglect to shed the Blood of Christ *Mystically* under Pretence of it's *Concomitancy* in the Host. The *2d* is, that as the Obligation of shedding the Victim's Blood *really* regarded the *Jewish Priests* only, and not the People in the old Law, so the Obligation of Shedding the Blood of Christ *Mystically* regards *Priests* alone, and not the People in the new Law. These two Parities, I say, are just and fair, but they can render you no Manner of Service.

You say, *the Church may as well take away the Bread and leave only the Cup*, and say that the *Flesh is contain'd in the Blood as well as the Blood in the Flesh*. Most certainly, Sr, the Church not only may but *do's* say, that the *All-glorious and incorruptible Body of Christ* is as inseparable from his *Blood*, as his *Blood* is from his *Body*: And she says this because she is

convinced, that neither the *Bread* is consecrated into *Dead Flesh*, nor the *Wine* into *Dead* or *inanimate Blood*. And therefore, if the *Church* had the same *rational* Motives to give only the *Cup* to the *Laity* as she has to give them only the *consecrated Bread*, she might lawfully do it. And if she did, the *People* would receive the *same Body* and *Blood of Christ* whole and entire as they now do: Nor would there be the least Difference in the *Thing received*, but only in the *Manner of Receiving*.

But here you cry out, *Strange Power of the Church! What Institution of God can stand at this Rate!* Sr, as long as there are true *Bishops* and *Priests* in the *World* who derive their *Ordination* from the *Apostles*, the *Institution of Christ* is in no Danger of Failing. So that your vehement Exclamation had been very much to the Purpose had it been worded thus; *Strange Insolence and Impiety of a few wretched Reformers, who by Denying the real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Eucharist have done what in them lies to abolish that August and Venerable Sacrifice, which Christ himself instituted and left by his last Will as the most precious Legacy he could bestow upon his holy Church!* For if such *Wickedness* can be justified, we may with Reason ask, *What Institution of God can stand at this Rate!*

G. But, My Lord, are not the *People* as much commanded to partake of the *Cup*, as of the *Bread*?

L. Sr, if by *Partaking of the Cup as well as of the Bread* you mean, *receiving the Blood of Christ as well as his Body*, I answer they are commanded to receive the one as well as the other, and so they do by *Receiving the Sacrament in one Kind only*. Because the *Body* and *Blood of Christ* are inseparable; nor is it possible to receive the one without receiving the

other, both *Body* and *Blood* being contain'd under *either Kind*.

G. But if the Church can take away *one Kind* from the People, may she not exert her Power a Step farther and take away *both*?

L. No, Sr, she cannot. Because the People are commanded to receive the *Body and Blood of Christ*. And this they could not do, if both the one Kind and the other were refused them. But as long as they receive the Sacrament in *either Kind*, they fully obey the Command of *Christ* in Receiving both his *Body and Blood*, which is all that is commanded. Nay I defy you to shew any positive Precept obliging the *Lainy* to receive it in *both Kinds*.

§. 39.

Lay-communion in one or both Kinds is a Point of Discipline only; and neither forbid, nor commanded by Christ.

„ G. **M**Y Lord, it is observable that *Christ*, as
 „ foreseeing this taking away of the Cup
 „ from many, added the Word *All* to the Drinking
 „ of the Cup. *Drink ye all of it*. Math. 26. v. 27. And
 „ it is said, *they drank All of it*. Mark 14. v. 23. it is
 „ not said so of the *Bread*. pag. 169.

L. Sr, since you are in your observing Mood, give me Leave to make my Observation too. viz. that *Christ*, as foreseeing that you and other *Protestants* would start this frivolous Objection against the Discipline of his *holy Church*, took Care that both *St Mark* and *St Luke* should furnish her with a solid Answer to it. For who were the *All* *St Mathew* speaks of? Were they not the same *All*, as are spoken of by *St Mark* saying, *and they all drank of it*, viz. the *Apostles*.

Apostles, who were the only Persons with our Saviour at his last Supper. For surely if the *Apostles* alone were the *All* that drank, they were likewise the *same All*, that were *bid to drink*. A strange Argument to prove, that the *Laity* are *all* bound to drink of the Cup!

G. But is it not remarkable, that *Christ* should in Distributing the *Bread* say no more than *take and eat*; yet in Giving the *Cup* should say expressly, *drink ye All of it*?

L. Sr, St *Luke* has insinuated a Reason for it, which utterly spoils the Force of your Observation. For he observes, that *Christ* himself *divided* the *Bread*, and gave to each *Apostle* the Morsel he was to eat. *Luke* C. 22. v. 19. So that all were not to *eat* of the same *Piece of Consecrated Bread*: But all were to *drink* of the *same consecrated Cup*; which therefore (according to St *Luke's* Relation) he gave them, and bid them *divide it among themselves*. v. 17. And this explains those *Words* of St *Mathew*, *drink ye ALL of it*; which was only said to caution them, that they were all to have their *Share* of the *Cup* he gave them: whereas this Caution was unnecessary as to the consecrated *Bread*, which he distributed with his own Hands.

G. But if these two Texts, *take and eat*, and *drink ye all of it*, regard the *Apostles alone*, you may say of the *Bread* as of the *Cup*, and take that too from the *Laity* by the same Rule. And you take the *Cup* from the *Priests*, who do not officiate. pag. 169. "

L. Sr, it is plain that the *Word All* in this Text *Drink ye all of it*, regarded the *Apostles alone*; because *they alone* were the Persons, whom *Christ* commanded to drink of that *consecrated Cup*, which he handed to them, and bid them *divide it among themselves*. But

the Institution itself of the *Eucharist* regarded the whole Church; that is, all the Faithful; tho not all in the same Manner. For, as it is a *Sacrifice*, the Institution regarded the *Apostles* immediately, and in them all *Bishops* and *Priests* deriving their Ordination from them. But as it is a *Sacrament*, the Institution regarded the *People* also, who therefore are bound to receive it for the *Spiritual Nourishment* of their Souls; But their *Manner of Receiving* it, that is, whether by the *Action* of *Eating* or *Drinking* or both, is not determined by the Institution itself.

» G. But, My Lord, *Christ* said to the *People*, to
 » the *Laitie*, except ye eat the *Flesh* of the *Son of Man*,
 » and drink his *Blood*, you shall have no *Life* in you.
 » Joh. 6. v. 53. And this is understood by all you of
 » the *Church of Rome* as spoken of the *Sacrament*.
 » pag. 169.

L. Sr, they, who understand this *Text* of the *Sacrament*, do likewise understand all that has a Relation to the same Subject in the Chapter from whence it is quoted: Which being supposed, your Observation, that *Christ* spoke those *Words* to the *People*, will do you no Service: because the rest of that Chapter was spoke to the *People* as well as those *Words*.

Now, as *Christ* said to the *People*, except you eat the *Flesh* of the *Son of Man*, and drink his *Blood* you shall have no *Life* in you. v. 53. And as it is said, who so eateth my *Flesh* and drinketh my *Blood* hath eternal *Life*. v. 58. So at the same Time he said to the *People*, If any *Man* EAT this *BREAD* he shall live for ever; and the *BREAD* that I will give is my *Flesh*, which I will give for the *Life* of the *World*. v. 52. And again. He that EATETH me shall live by me. v. 58. And thirdly. He that EATETH this *BREAD* shall live for ever. v. 59. In which three *Texts* not a *Word* is said of the

Cup, or of the *Action* of *Drinking*, but only of *Eating* the *Bread*.

Now to reconcile these with the other two *Texts*, where the *Cup* and *Drinking* are mention'd, it must necessarily be said, that by *Eating* and *Drinking* is only meant the *Action* of RECEIVING the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*, and not precisely the *Manner* of *Receiving* it: And so the *Precept* with Respect to the *Laity* regards not the *Way* or *Manner* of *Receiving*, but only the *Thing* received. Nay nothing can be more rational than this Interpretation of the foremention'd *Texts*: Because the only Drift of our Saviour's Discourse was to convince the Disbelieving *Capharnaits*, that unless their Souls were nourish'd with the real *Flesh* and *Blood* of the *Son* of *Man*, they should not have *Life everlasting*, and that they, who were made *Partakers* of his *Body* and *Blood*, should have *Life everlasting*. So that provided the real *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ* be but received, whether it be by the *Action* of *Eating*, or of *Drinking* only, or by both together, it is Manifest, that all worthy Communicants, as they receive whole *Christ*, who is the Fountain of *Grace* and *eternal Life*, so they fully satisfy the *End* of *Christ's Institution*, and perform all that is obligatory in the *Precept* of *Communion*.

ADVERTISEMENT.

Instead of this Answer, which delivers the true Sense of our Saviour's Words in St John, his Lordship in the Gentleman's Case stated contents himself with one of Bellarmin's supernumerary Answers; which tho' defensible, is useless and Superfluous. But the Gentleman had a Mind to be merry; and his Lordship was to give him a Handle for it; which he do's very opportunely

in Telling him, that Bellarmin says, that in this Text, except you eat, &c. and drink, &c. the Word And is to be taken for Or : where-with the Gentleman diverts himself in the following Manner.

„ G. That is to say, I may understand all the *Ands*
 „ in the *Creed* to be *Ors*; and instead of I believe this
 „ and this, I may say I believe this *or* this. So that, if
 „ I believe any *one Article* it is sufficient, tho I believe
 „ never another. If you send your Servant to Market,
 „ and bid him bring *Beef* and *Mutton* and *Pork*,
 „ and he buys only *Beef*, and says, he understood
 „ all your *Ands* for *Ors*. And so if you bid him
 „ bring so much *Meat* and so much *Drink*, and he
 „ brings only *Meat* for the same Reason. Thus we
 „ may easily get over all the Commands of God,
 „ and give the Reverse to St James, that *he who of-*
 „ *fends in one Point is guilty of all*. No, but *he who keeps*
 „ *one Point, keeps the whole Law*. This is *Bantering*
 „ instead of *Arguing*. And it shews a Cause to be
 „ very Destitute, when so great a Man as *Bellarmin*
 „ could content himself with Giving such an An-
 „ swer. pag. 169. 170.

L. Sr, I may truly say, *this is Bantering* instead of *Arguing*. Nay I perceive you are seiz'd with such a violent Fit of Drollery, that you choose to forfeit your Judgment rather than lose your jest. For, tho I am not disposed to espouse *Bellarmin's* Answer for the best that can be given, I cannot think he deserves the sharp Reflections, you have made upon him. What Sr! if the Word *And* may be taken in a *Disjunctive Sense*, and understood for *Or* in *one Text* of Scripture, do's it therefore follow, that it may be so understood in *all Texts* whatsoever, and the whole *Creed*! Can a Man of Sense be capable

of Arguing in this *Wild Manner*? Ought you not at least to have first proved, that *Bellarmin's* Interpretation of the *aforesaid Text* is wholly groundless and precarious, before you ventured to crow over him at that unmerciful Rate?

But Sr, I shall instance in a *Text*, wherein the Word *And* must be taken *disjunctively*, and understood for *Or*. The *Text* I mean are these Words of *St Peter*, *Gold and Silver I have none*. Act. 3. v. 6. I omit others of the same Kind for Brevity's Sake. But it is plain, that in this *Text* the Word *And* cannot but signify the same as *Or* to make *St Peter's* Words bear this Sense, *I have neither Gold nor Silver*, which doubtless is the true one. And do's it therefore follow, that all the *Ands* in *Scripture* must signify the same as *Or*? Or is there any Ground for your merry Banter of Sending a Servant to the Market for *Beef*, and *Mutton*, and *Pork*?

G. But, My Lord, what Reason had *Bellarmin* to say, that *And* signifies the same as *Or* in the *Text*, we have under Debate?

L. Sr, you ought to have examined that before you made yourself so Merry with a Man of his Learning. However to satisfy you, he grounded himself upon our *Saviour's* own Words in the very Chapter, whence the *Text* in Question is taken, and where *Christ* promises *eternal Life* no less than thrice to those, that shall eat the *Bread*, which himself explains to be his *Flesh* v. 15. without so much as Mentioning the *Cup*, or the *external Action* of *Drinking*. Whence *Bellarmin* justly concludes, that if this Precept, *except ye eat the Flesh and drink the Blood, &c.* regards the *External Forms* of *Eating* and *Drinking*, they must be understood *disjunctively* to reconcile them with the *other three Texts*.

This, Sr, suffices to shew, that *Bellarmin's* Answer

is not so absurd, as you have represented it in your merry Mood. And I should make no Difficulty to prefer this Answer, were I not convinced, that by *Eating and Drinking* is meant no more than RECEIVING both the Body and Blood of Christ into our Stomachs. For, as this fully answers the End of Christ's Institution, so is it an entire Fulfilling of the Precept of Communion; which regards not the Manner of Receiving, but the Things received: because they are the Things received that give eternal Life, and not the Formality or outward Actions, with which we receive them. This Common sense alone suffices to convince us of, and the Doctrine of Concomitancy is a Sequel of it.

» G. My Lord, the Doctrine of Concomitancy will
 » not do here. For, if I eat a Piece of *Flesh*, suppose
 » some *Blood* may be said to be concomitant there, yet
 » I cannot be said to drink, where there is not a
 » Drop. pag. 170.

L. What Sr! is there not a Drop of Blood in the real, Living, and incorruptible Body of Christ! Or do we eat Pieces cut from it, as we do Butchers-Meat! Strange wilful Ignorance!

» G. My Lord, the Threatning is, except ye
 » drink, there is no Life in you. pag. 170.

L. Yet Christ tells us at the same Time, that he that eateth this Bread shall live for ever. Which is a Demonstration, that by *Eating and Drinking* is effectually meant RECEIVING both his Body and Blood: tho his Blood be not convey'd into the Stomach by that material Action, which in Receiving ordinary Liquids is call'd Drinking.

» G. If it be but a Man's Testament (says St Paul)
 » yet if it be confirmed, no Man disannulleth, or addeth
 » thereto. Gal. 3. & 15. This holy Sacrament was the
 » last Testament, which Christ left to his Church insti-
 » tuted the Evening before he enter'd upon his sa-

red *Passion*. Therefore Pope *Gelasius* (*apud Gra-* " *ianum*) had good Reason to call it *Sacrilege* in " any , who should mutilate this *Sacrament* , and " commanded that they , who would not *drink* the " *Cup* , should be deny'd the *Bread* too. pag. 170. " 171. "

L. Sr , not only Pope *Gelasius* , but all the Popes that ever were in the *World* have judg'd it *Sacrilege* to mutilate the *Sacrament*. But will you know the *true Reason* , why Pope *Gelasius* commanded certain Persons to receive both the *consecrated Bread* and *Wine*?

G. I never heard a tolerable *Reason* for Taking " the *Cup* from the *Laity* , except because they were " the *Laity*. But the Dispute is not about the *Rea-* " *sons* for it , but the Thing itself. To take away " the *Cup* is to mutilate the *Sacrament* : And this is " *Sacrilege* by *Gelasius* his Determination. pag. 171. "

L. Sr , I tell you once more , that to mutilate the *Sacrament* is *Sacrilege* in the Judgment not of Pope *Gelasius* only , but of all *Catholicks* in the *World*. But where will you find it determined by Pope *Gelasius* , that *Lay-communion* in one Kind is *Mutilating* the *Sacrament*? This trivial Circumstance you have wholly overlook'd.

G. My Lord , I have refer'd you to his *Decree* in *Gratian*.

L. Who is of no Authority amongst us. But if you will needs refer me to that *Decree* , you must be content to take the *Gloss* along with it , which will set the Matter in it's true Light. There were certain *Priests* (says the *Gloss*) who duly consecrated the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ* , and received the *Host* , but abstain'd from the *Cup* : Which *Gelasius* being surpriz'd at said , he could not imagine through what *Superstition* they did so : and commanded them , that they should either receive

both as they consecrated both, or abstain both from Consecrating and Receiving. Because it is Sacrilege in a Priest offering Sacrifice to receive one without the other. And pray what Reference has this to Lay-Communion, or the Point in Question?

§. 40.

The Decrees of the Councils of Constance and Trent concerning Communion in one Kind are not contrary to Christ's Institution, nor the Faith of the primitive Church.

„ **G.** **T**He Testament of our Lord, which was con-
 „ firm'd by the Practice of the Church for
 „ fourteen hundred Years, was mutilated by the
 „ Council of Constance, and the Cup taken from the
 „ Laity with a non-obstante as well to the Institution
 „ of Christ, as the Practice of the Primitive Church. It
 „ was declared no Sacrilege, and the Priest was ex-
 „ communicated, who should communicate the
 „ Laity under both Kinds.

„ The Council of Trent likewise puts in it's *Saveat*
 „ to the Institution in both Kinds, and (that notwithstanding) the Laity must be excluded from the
 „ Cup: and they make it a *Heresy* to say that whole
 „ Christ is not under each Species. Then the Flesh is
 „ as much in the Blood, as the Blood in the Flesh.
 „ and it is all one, which Species we take. But since
 „ the Body and Blood of Christ were separated at his
 „ Death, and he ordain'd them to be so separated in
 „ the Sacrament of it, I see not how we can take
 „ away either Part upon the Account of their being
 „ not separated. pag. 171. 172.

L. Sr, I shall consider your last Words first; which have something in them very extraordinary.

For

For tho you have said many unwarantable Things; nothing can be more surprizing than what you tell now, viz. *that since the Body and Blood of Christ were separated at his Death, and he ordain'd them to be so separated in the Sacrament of it, you see not how we can take away either Part upon the Account of their being not separated.*

What Sr ! Has Christ ordain'd his Body and Blood to be so separated in the *Sacrament*, as they were at his *Death* ! If so, then as they were really separated at his Death, so are they really and truly (not *Mystically* only, as we say) separated in the *Sacrament*. And since a real Separation of Blood from the Body destroys the Life of it, it follows that Christ, tho *impassible* and *immortal*, has ordain'd himself to be destroy'd as really in the *Sacrament*, as he suffer'd Death upon the Cross. So that according to this Doctrine we receive a *dead Corps* in the *consecrated Host*, and *dead or inanimate Blood* in the *consecrated Wine*.

This, Sr, is the monstrous Assertion you are driven to, at least in Appearance, by Denying our Doctrine of *Concomitancy*. I say in *Appearance*; because I cannot think you so mad as to mean it in Earnest; tho you express it plainly in Words. For reflecting with myself that in our present Dispute I must not understand your Words according to their usual signification, I easily perceive you have a *Loop-hole* to creep out at; viz. that when you mention the *Body of Christ* in the *Sacrament* you mean nothing but a Morsel of *Bread*: and when you mention the *Blood of Christ*, and repeat it over and over again, and seem highly concern'd at our *Laity's* being deprived of it, you mean no more than a Sup of *Wine*: and to be sure there is no Absurdity in Maintaining, that the *Bread* and *Wine* are as really separated in the Sa-

crament, as Christ's *Body and Blood* were at his *Death*.

This I presume is your *Salvo* to come off with. But the Remedy is as bad as the Disease. For can any Thing betray a greater Insincerity, than to speak of the *Sacrament* as *Papists* do, and call it the *Body and Blood of Christ* twenty Times over, and yet mean nothing either of what they mean, or what the *Words* import of themselves? Do's it not shew, that in a Point of the greatest Consequence you dare not speak out, or call Things by their proper Names? And what can be the Reason of this Dissimulation, but a just Fear least the People, who are not only taught in their Catechisms, *that the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received in the Lord's Supper*, but are accusom'd to hear his *Body and Blood* continually spoken of in their *Communions*, should become sensible of the Cheat that is put upon them, if you should tell them in plain *Words* that there is nothing but *Bread and Wine* in the *Sacrament*? For, unless this be your Belief and real Meaning; that is, unless you mean *Bread*, when you say *Body*; and *Wine*, when you say *Blood*; you cannot avoid being guilty of the gross Absurdity I have charged you with when you say, *that Christ ordain'd his Body and Blood to be so separated in the Sacrament, as they were at his Death*.

For this Reason the Council of Trent defined it to be *Heresy* (they might have call'd it *Blasphemy*) to say *that whole Christ is not received under each Kind*: which you object as an Absurdity; as you likewise do what follows from it; viz. *that then the Body of Christ is as much join'd with his Blood, as the Blood with his Body*. But if these be Absurdities, then it follows, that they who believe *that the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received in the*

Lord's Supper, must believe that they receive *one Half* of Christ under one Kind, and the *other Half* under the other Kind.

Whence I conclude, that you cannot avoid one of these three Things. Either you must own, that you don't believe *the Body and Blood of Christ to be verily and indeed taken and received in the Lord's Supper*; and then you both contradict your Church which teaches that Doctrine, and your own plain Words so often repeated in this Dispute calling it the *Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament*, and arguing from it against our taking the *Cup* from the *Laity*: or you must maintain, that *one Half* of Christ is received under *one Kind*, and the *other Half* under the other *Kind* or *species*, which is most impiously and superlatively absurd: Or you must be content to take up with the *Jargon* of *Concomitancy* as you call it, and confess fairly that the *Body and Blood of Christ* being inseparable in this his glorious and immortal State, the one cannot be without the other. The first makes you both a rank *Calvinist* and profess'd *Equivocator*, the second a Madman, and the third a *Papist*. choose which you please.

G. But, My Lord, what do you say to the Councils of *Constance* and *Trent* taking away the *Cup* with a *non-obstante* both to the *Institution* of Christ, and the Practice of the primitive Church? This I think was a bold Attempt, and wholly unjustifiable.

L. Sr, they who can see no Difference between instituting both Kinds, and Commanding both Kinds to be received by *All*, must be wilfully blind. Christ instituted and administred the *Sacrament at Supper*; but we are not *commanded* to take the Sacrament at Supper, tho it be expressly call'd *the Lord's Supper*. The whole Question then is reduced to this Point, viz. whether all be *commanded* to receive the Sacra-

more in *both Kinds*? And whether the Councils of *Constance* and *Trent* took away the Cup with a *non-obstante* to the *Command of Christ*? Which we flatly say as a Thing unjustifiable and impious in itself: Tho *Protestants* do what they can to persuade the People that this is the true Meaning of the *Councils Non-obstante*: Which in Effect is Representation that *Council* to have been no better than an Assembly either of *Atheists* or *Madmen*. For who but *Atheists* or *Madmen* are capable of making a Decree like this? Viz. *Notwithstanding that Christ has commanded all Men to receive the Sacrament in both Kinds, it shall be given in one Kind only to the People*. Surely a Man must renounce his Reason to Judge, that an Assembly of *Christian Bishops* and *Pastors* in their Sense should combine together to make such a Mad and impious Decree in the Face of the whole World.

The true Meaning therefore of the *Council* is, that tho *Christ* instituted or consecrated *both Kinds*, that both might be offer'd in *Sacrifice*, yet there being a *Command* that obliges all to receive *both Kinds*, the *Council* order'd for just Reasons that the *Sacrament* should be administer'd to the *Laitie* in *one Kind* only: as the same *Council* order'd, that tho *Christ* had instituted and administer'd the *Sacrament* at *Supper*, all should be obliged to receive it *Fasting* (Persons dangerously sick alone excepted) and your *Church* differs with that Circumstance of the *Institution* no less than ours.

Now, Sr, as to the *Practice* of the *Primitive Church* (which by an *Hyperbole* of a very large Size you have extended to fourteen hundred Years) no Man doubts, but that *publick Communions* in *both Kinds* were practis'd by the *primitive Church*: Tho the common Practice of them was forborn long before the *Council of Constance*, which only made that Discipline

obligatory, which it found establish'd before in most Places by *Custom*. As appears from the Preface to it's Decree. Sess. 14. whereby it was render'd every where uniform.

But let that be as it will, if our Dispute is to be decided by the *Practice* of the *primitive Church*, you certainly lose your Cause. I go upon two *Principles*, which no *Protestant* will deny. 1. That the *Commands of Christ* cannot be *reversed* or *violated* upon any Pretence whatever. And 2. That administering *half a Sacrament* is a *Sacrilege*, which no Necessity can excuse. From these two Principles I infer that it was the undoubted Judgment of the *primitive Church*, that Administring the Sacrament in *one or both Kinds* is a Matter of *Discipline* only; whence it follows, that the *Council of Constance* could legally forbid *Lay-communion* in *both Kinds*, tho the contrary was practis'd in the *primitive Church*.

G. But, My Lord, how can we know the Judgment of the Church but from her *Practice*? If therefore *Lay-communion* in *both Kinds* was generally practis'd, as you own it was, in the *primitive Church*, must we not conclude she Judg'd the Practice of it *Necessary*?

L. Sr, you may conclude she Judg'd it *lawful*, which no Body denies. But the Question is, whether she did not Judge *Communion* in *one Kind* as *lawful* as in *both*? The Question is, whether it was her Judgment, that there is a *positive Command* of *Christ*, which obliges *all* to receive the *Sacrament* in *both Kinds*, and that it is *mutilated* when it is received in *one Kind* only? Finally the Question is, whether it was not the Judgment of the *primitive Church*, that to receive in *one or both Kinds* is a Thing *indifferent* in itself? If so, then she could not Judge both *Kinds Necessary*.

Now here you have her *Judgment* positively against you, if that may be certainly known by her *Practice*. For it appears from undoubted Facts, that in the *primitive* Ages the *Sacrament* was received sometimes in *both Kinds*, sometimes in *one*. I need not prove the *former*, and the *latter* is manifest from three undeniable Instances: For I omit several others for Brevity's Sake.

1. In the Communion of *Infants*, who were allow'd to drink of the *Cup* without Receiving the *consecrated Host*. Cyp. L. de Lapsis. 2. In *Domestick Communion*s: The Faithful being permitted by Reason of the Persecutions to carry *consecrated Host's*, but not the *consecrated Wine* to their own House for *private Communion*s. Tertul. L. 2. ad Uxorem. Cap. 5. and Cyp. Lib. de Lapsis. 3. in the Manner frequently used of Administring the *Sacrament* to the *Sick*. Euf. L. 6. Hist. C. 44. pag. 246. St *Ambrose* himself received it in that Manner when he was upon the Point of Death, as is recorded in the History of his Life.

From these undeniable Instances of *Communion*s in *one Kind* practis'd in the *primitive Church* I infer it was her Judgment, 1. That *Communion* in *one Kind* is not forbid by *Christ*, whose Laws cannot be violated upon any Pretence whatsoever. 2. That the *Sacrament* is not mutilated by it; for then it would be *Sacrilege* to receive it in *one Kind*, which the *Primitive Church* would not have suffer'd. 3. That neither the *Testament* of *Christ* is violated, nor the Faithful deprived of any Part of our Saviour's *Legacy*; both which are *Impieties*, which the *primitive Church* would have abhor'd. Whence I conclude again, that Receiving in *one* or *both Kinds* was regarded by the *primitive Church* as a Point of *Discipline* only; which therefore the *Church* has full Authority to change at any Time for just Reasons.

Now, if you desire to know the Reasons, that induced the *Church* to forbid the *Cup* to the *Laity*, you may find them in the *Catechism ad Parochos de Euch. Sacram. Sect. 70*. But the chief was to prevent even casual and involuntary *Prophanations* by Spilling any *Drops* of the consecrated *Wine*: which was almost unavoidable in a great Croud of Communicants.

G. My Lord, I leave it to yourself, whether “the Reasons in that *Catechism* be not *Childish*; or “are of *Weight* to *main* the *Institution* of *Christ*. “pag. 172. “

L. Sr, your groundless Clamour about our *Maiming* the *Institution* of *Christ* deserves that Compliment much better, as I have sufficiently shew'd. But the Reasons given by the *Catechism* can only appear *Childish* to those, who either believe not a *Word* of the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ* being received verily and indeed in the *Sacrament*; or tho they do believe it have Consciences of so large a Size, as not be much concern'd about *Prophanations*.

One of the Reasons given by the *Catechism* for Taking away the *Cup* is because some Constitutions can neither endure the smell nor Taste of *Wine*. This I presume you take to be a very *Childish* one. But the *French Protestants* did not think it so. For in their Synod at *Poitiers* An. 1560. they decreed [Ch. 13. Art. 7. of the *Lord's Supper*] that the *Bread* of our *Lord's Supper* ought to be administer'd to those, who cannot drink *Wine*. This I think is a good *Protestant Testimony*, that Receiving the Communion in one Kind is neither *Sacrilege*, nor *Mangling* the *Sacrament*; nor a *Violation* of any *Divine Precept*. For if it were, no Necessity could excuse it; and they who could not receive both *Kinds*, would be obliged to receive neither the one nor the other.

„ G. Tis certain , My Lord , there must be no
 „ Comparifon made betwixt the *Body* and *Blood* of
 „ *Chrift* as to Preference , or which is moft valua-
 „ ble. But our *Redemption* is oftner attributed in
 „ holy Scripture to his *Blood* than to his *Body*. *We*
 „ *are faved by the Blood* ----- *Propitiation through his*
 „ *Blood* ----- *By the Sprinkling of his Blood* ----- &c.
 „ pag. 172. 173.

L. Here again , Sr , who will not imagine you believe as firmly as any *Papift* in the *World* , that the *Body and Blood of Chrift* are really and truly prefent in the *Sacrament* ? For we muft either fuppose this to be your Belief , or that you are the greateft Difsembler imaginable of your Faith. Either therefore you believe the *Body and Blood of Chrift* to be prefent in the *Sacrament* , or you do not. If not , all you fay now is rank Diffimulation and Hypocrify ; fince you both fpeak of it and argue from it as if you did. But if you do believe it , you muft renounce common Sense to fay we can receive the *living Body of Chrift* without receiving his *Blood* : and if his *living Body* cannot be received without his *Blood* (as furely it cannot) what can be more impertinently quoted than the abovesaid three Texts , even tho they had a Reference to the *Eucharift* ? Whereas they are manifetly fpoken of the *Blood of Chrift* as shed upon the *Croß* for our *Redemption*. But his Attributing *Life everlasting* , that is , the whole Fruit of the *Sacrament* to *Eating* alone *Joh. 6. v. 58.* comes I think fomewhat clofer up to the Purpose.

§. 41.

*Some sophistical Remarks upon the 6th of St John
answer'd.*

G. MY Lord, we take not this as spoke of *the Sacrament*, but of *Faith in Christ* here *express'd by Eating*; that is *spiritually*, as himself *explains it* *ψ. 63. it is the Spirit that quickneth, the Flesh profiteth nothing. The Words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit, and they are Life.* pag. 173. "

L. Sr, I have fully explain'd the true Meaning of this Text in our Dispute concerning *Transubstantiation* (S. 25.) so if you have any Thing more to say, I am ready to give you full Satisfaction.

G. But let us now suppose, those Words, if *any Man eat this Bread he shall live for ever. And, the Bread I will give is my Flesh, which I will give for the Life of the World.* Let us, I say, suppose them to be understood of the *Sacrament* as you do, you will find the *Blood* join'd with the *Flesh* in the next Words. *ψ. 54. Except you eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood ----* as before quoted. And again, *ψ. 55. Whoso eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood ----* and *ψ. 56. For my Flesh is Meat indeed, and my Blood is drink indeed.* and *ψ. 52. he that eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood.* Is not the *Blood* here named with the *Flesh*? But if it were not, there are a hundred Places, as I now observed, where the *Blood of Christ* is named as *cleansing*, as *Redeeming* us, &c. without any mention of his *Flesh* or *Body*. Are they therefore *excluded*? This is such a Sort of Reasoning, as if I invite you to eat with me you must have no Drink to your Dinner, because it is not named. pag. 173. 174. "

L. Pray, Sr, what *Catholic Divine* in the *World* ever said, that when the *Flesh* or *Body* of Christ is mention'd alone in holy Scripture, his *Blood* is excluded? Or that it is not necessary to receive his *Blood* as well as *Body*? On the contrary we maintain expressly, that Christ's *Body* and *Blood* are wholly inseparable; whence we conclude, that his *Body* cannot possibly be received without his *Blood*, nor his *Blood* without his *Body*; and that, by Consequence, *whole Christ* is always received whether by a Communion in *one* or *both Kinds*: so far are we from excluding the Necessity or Obligation of Receiving his *Blood*. So pray, Sr, leave off Beating the Air, and Fighting against your own Shadow.

As to your pleasant Parity of *inviting me to eat with you, and giving me no Drink to my Dinner, if you do not expressly name it*; I assure you, Sr, I shall take it very ill to be so used: unless you can contrive Matters so, that Eating alone shall be equivalent both to *Eating* and *Drinking*; which is the Case in the *Lord's Supper*; where our *Spiritual Meat* and *Drink*, that is, the *Body* and *Blood* of Christ are inseparable, as I have fully proved. So that whoever eats his *Body*, by the same Action receives his sacred *Blood* into his Stomach. And so I hope that when I come to eat with you, you will not refuse me Drink by Way of Argumentation.

» G. But, My Lord, if by Eating we commonly
 » mean the *whole Meal*, and *Drinking* is likewise in-
 » cluded, the Criticism upon the *Lord's Supper* will
 » appear what it is, and not be thought sufficient to
 » exclude the *Cup* in the *Sacrament*, and you have
 » no other Foundation in Scripture. pag. 174.

L. Sr, I grant that by *Eating* is commonly meant the *whole Meal*, and that *Drinking* is likewise included if we speak of ordinary Meals, because in these

the Action of *Eating* or *Drinking* alone cannot convey both *Meat* and *Drink* into our Stomachs. But the Case is quite otherwise in the *Lord's Supper*; where, as I told you just now, our *spiritual Meat and Drink*, that is, the *Body and Blood of Christ* being inseparable are convey'd into our Stomachs either by the Action of *Eating* or *Drinking* alone. And this is no *Criticism*, but a solid Truth; unless you will maintain this impious Absurdity, that we receive *one Half* of Christ by *Eating*, and the *other Half* by *Drinking*.

This therefore suffices to justify *Communion in one Kind*. Because whoever receives the *whole Body and Blood of Christ* cannot surely be said to be defrauded of any Part of the *spiritual Meal*, he has ordain'd for us.

But since you tell me, we have no other Foundation in Scripture, but what I have insisted upon from the 6th Chapter of *St John* (tho that might suffice) I think *St Paul* has laid a very solid Foundation both of our *Doctrine* and *Discipline* in the two following Texts. *First*, that *Christ being raised from the Dead dieth no more*. *Rom. 6. v. 9*. And *2dly*, that *whosoever shall eat this Bread, OR drink this Cup unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of our Lord*. *1. Cor. C. 11. v. 27*. Whence (besides a clear innuendo, that the primitive Christians did sometimes either only eat the *Bread*, or only drink the *Cup*) it follows plainly, that as either *Eating* OR *Drinking* unworthily suffices to render us guilty both of the *Body and Blood of our Lord*, so either *Eating* OR *Drinking* worthily suffices to render us Partakers both of his *Body and Blood*.

I know your Translators have boldly falsified this Text of *St Paul* by changing OR into AND, to avoid the force of this Argument: and there is not a lear-

ned Man amongst you but knows it. Yet it stands to this Day uncorrected in your Bibles. So tender is your Church of the Purity of God's Words.

» G. But, My Lord, if I once call it *Eating* the
 » *Lord's Supper*, and several Times call it both *Ea-*
 » *ting* and *Drinking*, will not the latter explain the
 » Former? Or will *Eating* exclude *Drinking*, tho'
 » *Drinking* be expressly named? To eat the *Lord's*
 » *Supper* is the only Phrase we use, I never heard
 » any Body call it *Drinking* the *Lord's Supper*. And
 » you may thence prove that we have not the *Cup*
 » in our *Sacrament* as well as that the Apostles had
 » it not; because it is said, they eat *Bread*, and
 » broke *Bread*. But I have overlabour'd this Point,
 » because you lay so much Stress upon it. pag.
 » 174.

L. You have indeed overlabour'd it, and shew'd yourself a most skilful Puzzle-Cause in darkning and perplexing the clearest Truth. You ask, if it be once call'd *Eating* the *Lord's Supper*, and several Times both *Eating* and *Drinking*, whether the latter do's not explain the former? I answer the latter do's so far explain the former as to render it manifest, that no Man eats the *Lord's Supper*, unless he receives both his *Body* and *Blood* into his Stomach. But since I have demonstrated that this is done either by *Eating* or *Drinking* only, a man must renounce common Sense to pretend, that the external Form both of *Eating* and *Drinking* is necessary.

You ask again, whether *Eating* do's exclude *Drinking*, tho' *Drinking* be expressly named? I answer it do's not; if by *Drinking* be meant, receiving the *Blood* of Christ. Because his *Body* and *Blood* being inseparable, we cannot eat his *Body* without receiving his *Blood*. But if you mean no more than the external Form of *Drinking*, it is neither excluded by the Texts which

mention *Eating alone*, nor commanded by the Texts, which mention *them both*. But our Saviour's Attributing the whole Virtue and Efficacy of the Sacrament sometimes to *Eating alone*, other Times to *Eating and Drinking join'd together* shews very plainly that it is not the *external Form*, or Manner of Receiving under *One or both Kinds*, but the *Thing received*, which bestows Grace and Life everlasting on the worthy Receiver.

Finally, you tell me, you never call it otherwise than *Eating the Lord's Supper*, and that I may prove thence that you have not the Cup in the Sacrament as well as that the Apostles had it not, because it is said, they eat Bread, and broke Bread. But pray Sr, when did I prove from those Words, that the Apostles had not the Cup? I never said any such Thing, and so you ought not to charge me with it. I have indeed drawn an Argument from the 6th Chapter of St John, where our Saviour attributes the whole Virtue of the Sacrament to *Eating alone*, as well as to *Eating and Drinking*. But can I therefore pretend to prove, that you have not the Cup in the Sacrament, because you call it *Eating the Lord's Supper*? No, Sr, I am not disposed to trifle thus with Words; because I know your Meaning both from your Principles, and constant Practice: Whereas I find the very Reverse of those Principles in the Word of God. I find St Paul telling the Romans, that Christ being raised from the Dead dieth no more. 6. & 9. the Consequence whereof is, that his Body and Blood are now inseparable; and this is the very Foundation of the Doctrine of Concomitancy. Whence it follows, that Communion in one Kind cannot be a mangled Sacrament, as you pretend. I find the same Apostle telling the Corinthians, that whosoever shall eat the Bread, or drink the Cup unworthily, shall be guilty of

the Body AND Blood of our Lord. 1. Cor. II. v. 27. Now, if *either Eating Or Drinking* unworthily suffices to render us *guilty both of the Body and Blood of our Lord*, 'tis manifest that *either eating or Drinking* worthily suffices to render us *Partakers* both of his *Body and Blood*. From these two Principles clearly deliver'd in holy Writ we may legally infer, that our Saviour's often Attributing the whole Virtue and Efficacy of the Sacrament to *Eating alone* is a solid Proof, that when he mentions *both Eating and Drinking* it is not meant as a Precept to oblige all to receive the Sacrament *in both Kinds*, but only to receive his *Body and Blood*, which is done by a Communion *in one Kind* as well as *both*; as I have fully demonstrated to any Man, who believes the *Body and Blood* of Christ to be really and truly present in the *Sacrament*.

But who are the Persons appointed by Christ to be the *Interpreters* of his sacred Word? *He that heareth you (says Christ) heareth me, and he that despiseth you, despiseth me.* Luke 10. v. 16. Again, who are the Persons commission'd by him to *feed and govern* his Flock, and prescribe the proper Methods of *Administring* the Sacraments? St Paul resolves the Question in these few Words. *Let a Man so account of us as of the Ministers of Christ, and the Stewards of the Mysteries of God.* 1. Cor. 4. v. 1. From which two Texts it is plain, that the *Bishops and Pastors* of the Church, who are the *Successors* of the *Apostles*, and to whom Christ has promised his *perpetual Assistance*, are the only Persons authoriz'd by him to *interpret* the Word of God, and regulate the Manner of *Dispensing* the Sacred *Mysteries* to the People. And was it not then a most insolent Madness (for St Austin speaking of a parallel Case gives it no softer Name) in a few private Persons to pretend to understand

Scriptures better, than all the *Bishops* and *Pastors* of *God's Church* had done for fifteen Ages together, and prescribe Laws for the *Administration* of *Sacraments* in Opposition to all *Ecclesiastical Authority* upon Earth?

If there were any *positive Command* Obliging all to receive *both Kinds*, is it probable the *Universal Church* could have been so blind as not to see it? And if they saw it, what Motive could her *Bishops* and *Pastors* have to combine together in a Resolution to commit a damnable Sin by *Forbidding* what *Christ* had *commanded*, when there was neither *Honour*, *Interest*, nor *Pleasure*, nor any visible human Motive to induce them to it? Tis certain therefore that when they took the *Cup* from the *Laitie*, that is, when they made that a *Law*, which had been the general Practice long before, they were convinced in their Hearts of two Things. 1. That the People were not injured by it, and 2ly, that there was no *Command*, that obliged them to receive it. And if neither they, nor the *great Lights* of the *Primitive Church* could ever discover any *such Command*, it looks like a *Chimera* rather than a *Probability*, that a Set of obscure factious Persons without *Mission* or *Authority* from any *lawful Superiour* should be more intelligent and clear sighted in *Divine Matters* than they, and see Things wholly unseen before. Truly, Sir, if *Bedlam* should set up for a *School of Learning*, *Children* for *Masters* to their *Teachers*, and the *Blind* for *Guides* to their *Leaders*, the Thing would be as little Surprising in itself as the *Presumption* and *Arrogance* of any Set of Men pretending to be *Wiser* than the *Universal Church*. This alone suffices to stop the Mouth of any pretended *Reformer*, who is not lost to all Sense of *Modesty*, as *Luther* certainly was, when he made this Declaration, that if a *Council*

should either appoint or permit Communion in both Kinds, he would in Spite of that Council either receive it in one Kind, or in neither. Hist. de Variat. C. 2. §. 10. This was Speaking like a true Reformer. But enough of this: so I desire you to proceed to some other Matter.

§. 42.

Of Celibacy, or the Single Life of Priests.

G. I shall now shew you another Restriction, your Church has made upon the Institutions of God. As she has taken the Cup from the Laity, so she has taken another of your Sacraments, that is, Marriage from the Clergy. pag. 174.

L. I perceive, Sr, you are now Going to fight *pro Aris & Focis*. And me thinks I see a formidable Army of all the Bishops and Parsons Wives and Children in Great Britain drawn up in Battle against me. But I comfort myself, that I have St Paul of my Side, who never begot Children (for ought I ever heard of) but in Jesus-Christ through the Gospel. 1. Cor. 4. & 15. Nay I have the Practice of the whole College of Apostles for me. I mean not the Apostles of the Reformation, but the Apostles of Jesus-Christ; if St Jerom may be believed, who tell us Epist. 50. that they were either unmarried, or had no Commerce with their Wives: Meaning, after they were call'd to the Ministry of the Gospel.

But least I should be guilty of giving any Disquiet to that Part of the fair Sex, who think themselves married to true Bishops and Priests, I assure them they may continue with a safe Conscience to live with their Husbands: At least they need to have no scruple about it, till their Husbands can prove the Validity of their Ordination as fully as we can

prove

prove that Persons *validly ordain'd* cannot marry according to the *Ancient Laws* of the Church.

G. I perceive then your Lordship do's us the Favour to think, our *married Bishops* and *Parsons* live not in a State of *Adultery*.

L. Sr, I should wrong them very much, if I thought they did. For I see no Manner of Reason why *Protestant Bishops* and *Parsons* may not marry as well as the *Protestant Laity*. So that whatever I say concerning the *Celibacy* or *single Life* of *Bishops* and *Priests* is no Reflection upon your Church as now establish'd, but only a Vindication of my own. And I think I may modestly say I plead the more honourable Cause of the two. For *Virginity* is commendable even in *Laymen*. The *ancient Fathers* have writ whole Volumes in Commendation of it, and St Paul recommends it preferably to *Marriage*. 1. Cor. 7. v. 32. 33. 38. Nay he advises even Married Persons to abstain from the conjugal Duty for a Time, *that they may give themselves* (says he) *to Prayer*. 1. Cor. 7. v. 5. Upon which Words St Jerom writes thus against Jovinian Lib. 1. C. 19. *If a Layman* (says he) *cannot pray without Abstaining sometimes from the Conjugal Duty, a Priest who must always offer Sacrifice, must always pray: and if he must always pray, he must always be unmarried.*

This Jovinian (whom St Jerom stiles the *Christian Epicure*) was the *Martin Luther* of his Time in openly Opposing the Lawfulness of *Religious Vows*, and the *Celibacy* of *Priests*: And, if the World had then been ripe for a *Godly Reformation*, he would have saved *Luther* some Part of his Trouble. But the Church was then too *Popishly* affected to suffer him to prevail. For he no sooner appear'd upon the Stage but was excommunicated, and his *Heresy* condemn'd first by a Council at Rome under Pope *Siricius*, St Ambr.

Epist. 6. and afterwards by a Council at Milan. Epist. 7. and by the Writings of St Ambrose St Jerom and St Austin, who exhorted as many as they could both Men and Women to consecrate themselves to God by Religious Vows, tho Jovinian urged the same Texts of Scripture against it as are now commonly made Use of by Protestants. But because he seduced some ignorant Virgins by Saying, *are you better than Abraham Sara &c.* St Austin bid them answer, *I am not better than Abraham, but the Chastity of a single Life is better than the Chastity of Marriage.* Lib. de bono Conjug. C. 28. How different was the Spirit of those eminent Lights of the Church from that of our late Reformers.

Now St Paul's Recommending a Single Life as the *perfecter State* even to Laymen was doubtless the principal Motive that induced the Church to prohibit the Marriage of Priests. For, as their Priestly Character obliges them to a greater Perfection than that of Laymen, it is but reasonable they should embrace the *perfecter State*. And since the Duties of the married State are look'd upon by the same Apostle as a Hindrance to Prayer, they whose Office it is to assist at the Altar and pray not only for themselves but the People also, seem to be call'd and destined by God to no other Marriage than that of the Lamb. Nothing certainly appears more congruous in itself than that a Person, whose Functions are wholly Spiritual, and whose Time ought to be divided between the Duties of Study and Prayer and the Care of Souls, should be free from the Concern of Wife and Children, and not imbarck'd in all the Solitudes of this Life like Wordly Persons.

This then is the first Rule, on which I ground my Justification of the Church's Discipline relating to the Celibacy of Priests: viz. *because a single Life is of itself*

a more perfect State, and more becoming the Clergy than the Conjugal State.

The second Rule is, that tho many married Persons were in the *Primitive Ages* admitted or rather compell'd to holy Orders in Consideration of their Extraordinary Merits, yet none were allow'd to marry after their Ordination. The Council of Nice affords us a Proof of this Truth. For that Council intending to make a Decree to separate even such Bishops Priests and Deacons from their Wives as had been married before their Ordination, was indeed dissuaded from it by St Paphnucius: yet it decreed that such as came unmarried into the Clergy, should always remain single according to the ancient Tradition of the Church. Socrates Lib. 1. Hist. C. 8. *illud satis esse, ut qui in Clerum ante adscripti erant quam duxissent uxores, hi secundum veterem Ecclesia Traditionem deinceps a Nuptiis abstinerent.*

'Tis plain then that according to the ancient Discipline of the Church none were allow'd to marry after their Admission to holy Orders even in the Eastern Church, and as to the Discipline of the western Church St Jerom writes thus. *Bishops Priests and Deacons are either chosen Virgins or Widowers; or at least abstain after Priesthood from the Use of Marriage as long as they live.* Epist. 50.

This then is the second Rule I go by. viz. that according to the ancient Discipline of the Church none were permitted to marry after they were once engaged in holy Orders.

The third Rule is, that all Vows freely made to God are binding. This none but Atheists can deny, because God himself has declared it. *When thou shalt vow a Vow unto the Lord thy God, thou shalt not slack to pay it ----- that which is gone out of thy Lips thou shalt keep and perform.* Deut. 23. v. 21. 23. And St

Paul says of *Widows* consecrated to God, that when they have begun to wax wanton against Christ they will marry having Damnation because they have cast off their first Faith. 1. Tim. 5. v. 11. 12.

The fourth and last Rule is, that the single Life of Bishops and Priests is a Matter of Ecclesiastical Government or Discipline only. Whence I infer first, that the Church had always full Authority to make it a Law; especially in Regard of those who freely offer themselves to holy Orders. For, if they be not disposed to perform the Conditions upon which they are received, they ought not to engage themselves. I infer 2dly, that tho the Primitive Church had made no such Law, the Church might lawfully have done it in After-Ages at least in Reference to such, as were not already engaged. Because the Church of Christ has always the same Authority; nor is there any Reason why she should lose any Part of it by Time or Age. Now Sr, you may put what Objections you please.

§. 43.

Objections answer'd.

G. MY Lord, I pass by the politick Views and Advantages the Court of Rome has in this, as giving the Pope the more absolute Command, and making him in Effect Heir of all the great Possessions of the Clergy. For the Canon-law obliges the regular Bishops not to dispose of their Estates, and the other Clergy not to be too liberal of their Almes in their Sickness. And what they leave the Pope disposes of as grand Treasurer of the Church. pag. 173. 174.

L. Sr, I never heard the Pope was Heir to the

hereditary Estates either of Bishops or Priests. And as to their Benefices or Ecclesiastical Revenues, they pass of Course to the next incumbents; and they may dispose of their ready Cash as they Judge fitting during their Lives, without being accountable for it to any but God alone. So that it is beyond my Comprehension how the *Celibacy* of Bishops and Priests should make the Pope in Effect Heir of all the great Possessions of the Clergy, as you are pleas'd to tell me.

G. My Lord, I am content to wave this Argument, and will only insist upon what relates to *Conscience*. pag. 175. "

L. Very well, Sr.

G. You reckon it a Defilement in your Church for a *Clergyman* to marry. No great Compliment to the married State, which yet was instituted by God in *Paradise*, whilst Man was in his innocence. pag. 175. "

L. Sr, we reckon it a Defilement in a Priest to be false to a solemn Engagement made to God; and so do's *St Paul* reckon it one even in the *Laiety*. 1. Tim. 5. v. 11. 12. And I hope all true Christians are of the same Mind. Nor do I think a Man is bound by any Institution, tho made in the State of Innocence, to commit a *Sacrilege* out of a Compliment to the married State.

G. The Apostle says, *Marriage is honourable in all, and the Bed undefiled*. Heb. 13. v. 4. pag. 175. "

L. But *Sacrilege* is not honourable in any; nor is a *sacrilegious Bed undefiled* tho colour'd over with the Name of Marriage. The incestuous Marriage of the *Corinthian* whom *St Paul* deliver'd up to Satan 1. Cor. 5. v. 5. was not very honourable. Nor the Marriage of *Widows* who began to wax *Wanton against Christ*. And *Luther's Marriage* with a *Nun* was

just as honourable as any of These. Lastly, tho *Marriage be honourable* according to *St Paul*, the State of *Celibacy* is still more honourable according to the same Apostle; and the more honourable State is surely best becoming the honourable Character of Bishops and Priests; otherwise *St Paul* would not have made Choice of it for himself.

„ *G.* But *Forbidding to marry* is reckon'd one of the „ *Doctrines of the Devil*. 1. Tim. 4. v. 3. pag. 175.

L. Forbidding to marry as a Thing unlawful in itself (as the *Manichees* and *Marcionites* did) is the *Doctrine of Devils*. But forbidding particular Persons (who have voluntarily consecrated themselves to God) to marry is not the *Doctrine of Devils* but the *Doctrine of St Paul* in the very next Chapter, where he tells *Widows* consecrated to God, that if they marry they gain *Damnation* to themselves. Besides I never heard the *Devil* was the Author of forbidding Marriages within the *prohibited Degrees*; in which your Church is as much concern'd as ours.

„ *G.* My Lord, Directions are given by *St Paul* „ how a *Bishop* should govern his *Wife* and *Children*. „ For if a *Man* knows not how to rule his own *House*, „ how shall he take Care of the *House of God*? 1. Tim. „ C. 3. v. 5. Yet your Interpreters would have this „ *Wife* and this *House* to be the Church. pag. 175.

L. Sr, *St Paul's* Words are clear enough to be their own Interpreters. For they can mean nothing else than that a Person, who suffers or countenances Disorders in his own private Family, is not fit to govern the *Church of Christ*.

However, tho in the Chapter you have quoted I find Directions both how a *Bishop* is to govern his *Children* and *Deacons* their *Wives*, yet I do not find the Directions you speak of, viz. how a *Bishop*

should govern his *Wife*: which seems to be an insinuation that the Bishops then chosen, tho they were actually married, lived separated from their *Wives*.

'Tis true *St Paul* tells us in the 2d Verse of the same Chapter, that *a Bishop must be the Husband of one Wife*; the Meaning whereof cannot surely be that *St Paul* obliged Bishops to be married; for then he was bound to follow his own Rule; but that no Man was fit to be a Bishop who had been married oftner than *once*. And the Reason which induced the Apostle to prescribe that Rule in the Choice of *Deacons* as well as *Bishops* was, because tho in his Time Virginity was so rare both amongst *Jews* and *Gentiles*, that if neither married Men nor *Widowers* had been promoted to holy Orders, the Church would have been destitute of necessary Pastors, yet even then he would not have those taken to the Altar who had been *married twice*; because they appear'd to have stronger Ties to the earth, than were suitable to so holy an Employment.

G. My Lord, *St Peter* was a married Man and "forsook not his *Wife* after he was an Apostle, "but led her about with him as other Apostles did. "*1. Cor. 9. v. 5. pag. 175. "*

L. Sr, this Description of the *Apostles* trailing about their *Wives* and conversing with them as such, appears to me so dishonourable to their sacred Character and unsuitable to their Apostolick Functions, that I wonder how any sober thinking Man can give into it. Did not *St Peter* say to Christ, *behold we have forsaken all and follow'd thee?* *Math. 19. v. 27.* And were not their *Wives* a Part of the *All* they had forsaken?

G. But do's not *St Paul* say expressly, *have we not Power to lead about a Sister a Wife as well as the other*

Apostles, and as the Brethren of the Lord and Cephas.

1. Cor. 9. v. 5.

L. Sr, the *English Protestant Bible* says so but not *St Paul*, who declaring himself to be *unmarried* Chapter 7th. v. 8. could not pretend to lead about a *Wife* Chapter the 9th. Neither did *St Peter* nor the other *Apostles* lead their *Wives* about, since *St Jerom* Epist. 50. declares positively, that the *Apostles* who were married lived separated from their *Wives*. And writing against *Jovinian* who quoted that very Text of *St Paul*, tells him it ought to be translated, *have we not Power to lead about a Sister a Woman? &c.* meaning some ancient *Matrone* or *Diaconissa* as attended *St Peter* and other *Apostles* in their *Travels*, and provided *Necessaries* for them either out of their own subsistence or the *Alms* of the *Faithful*. Nay I perceive your own Church begins to have some *Diffidence* of their *Translation*. For in the late Edition of the Bible in two large *Folios* at *Oxford*; tho *Wife* be kept in the Text, *Woman* is put in the Margin. Which is at least one Step towards an *Acknowledgment* of the Truth; and I pray God to improve it.

» G. My Lord, that in the primitive Church the
» Clergy did marry is plain from *Socrates*. Hist. Ec-
» cles. L. 1. C. 11. and L. 5. C. 22. pag. 175.

L. Sr, it is plain not only from *Socrates* but all *Ecclesiastical Historians* that many of the primitive *Bishops* and *Priests* were married Men. But it is no less plain from *Socrates*, as I have shew'd before, that the *Council of Nice* made a Decree to prohibit any *Bishop* or *Priest* to marry after his *Ordination*.

» G. My Lord, the Vows of single Life were not
» imposed upon the Clergy till Pope *Hildebrand*.
» See *Math. Westm.* ad An. 1074, *Vincent. Spec. Hist.*
» L. 24. C. 45. *Antoninus* L. 16. C. 1. §. 21. And it was
without

without Precedent (says Sigibert Chron. ad An. 1074.) "and, as many thought, out of an indiscreet Zeal contrary "to the Opinion of the holy Fathers. But Hildebrand was "not obey'd in this in England for above a hun- "dred Years after. For our ancient Records say " (Hist. Petroburg. An. 1127. apud Spelman) all these "Decrees avail'd nothing. For the Priests by the King's "Consent had still their Wives as formerly. pag. 176. "

L. Sr, it is not at all material, whether Pope Hildebrand was or was not the first that impos'd Vows of a single Life upon the Clergy. For such a Vow could only inforce the Obligation they were already under by the ancient Canons of the Church, which had never been repeal'd; and so it oblig'd them to nothing, but what they were oblig'd to before. Just as if a Vow to keep the Fast of Lent were now impos'd upon Roman Cathoicks, no Man could legally infer from it, that it was therefore a new Thing, or a Duty they were not strictly oblig'd to comply with independently of such a Vow. All therefore we can gather from that Fact and the other related by Spelman (if it be literally true, which may be question'd) all, I say, we can gather from it is, that in the 11th and 12th Century great irregularities were practis'd by many of the inferiour Clergy, who kept their Concubines, and call'd them Wives, but were no more so, than Kate Boren was the lawful Wife of Martin Luther. And to shew they were regarded by the Church no otherwise than as Concubines, besides many other Synodal Decrees against them in other Places, there was a general Synod held at London by the Pope's Legate in the very Year mention'd by Spelman, in which several Canons were made for the Reformation and Celibacy of the Clergy, says Mr Echard in his History of England, L. 2. C. 1. pag. 174. But the same Author adds, that they

II. Part. M m

were not much regarded (as the very Laws of God are but little regarded by Libertines) till some few Years after An. 1129. the King desirous to settle the Celibacy of the Clergy in a Synod call'd on Purpose; through the Weakness of the Archbishop (as Mathew Paris expresses it) obtain'd Power to have the sole Execution of this Law himself; but instead of Restraining the pretended Abuse, he punish'd them in their Purses, and receiving Sums from a great many of them he permitted them to enjoy their Wives as formerly.

Now this Relation of Mr Echard gives a very different turn to the whole Matter from that of *Spelman*. For what he calls the King's Consent, is here fairly represented as a bare Connivance, into which the King was bridled by large Sums of Money: and the severe Laws made by the two Synods, Mr Echard speaks of, against those of the Clergy who kept Concubines tho they call'd them Wives, is a Proof, that the Bishops assembled in those Synods regarded it as a sinful Abuse, which stood highly in Need of a Reformation: and in Effect they who practis'd it were always branded with the infamous Name of Concubinarians, which is but a softer Word for what we call in plain English, Whoremasters.

„ G. My Lord, Gregory the Great said, that it was
 „ lawful for such of the Clergy, as could not contain, to
 „ marry. (Resp. ad Interrog. 2m. Aug. Cant.) and
 „ Pius II. said the same, that they may be allow'd to
 „ marry. Platina. pag. 176.

L. Sr, I must here accuse you of very foul Dealing in both these Quotations. As to Pope Gregory, you have falsified him by Stifling that Part of his Words, which fully explain his meaning. They are these. *If there be any of the Clergy, WHO ARE NOT IN HOLY ORDERS, and cannot contain, they ought to marry.* Now there are great Numbers in our Cler-

gy, who are neither *Priests*, *Deacons*, nor *Subdeacons*, but only in *lesser Orders*; who therefore are free to return to the *World* and marry. And so *St Gregory's Words* instead of *Allowing the Marriage* either of *Priests*, *Deacons*, or *Subdeacons*, who are all in *holy Orders*, imply a *Prohibition* of it according to this *Maxim*, *exceptio confirmat legem*: because it would be meer *Trifling* to limit a *Law*, that is not in *Force*.

As to the *Words* of *Pius II.* (for which you quote *Platina* in his *Life*) they seem to import no less, than that *Pope Pius* being consulted as *Head of the Church*, whether *Priests* that could not contain might marry, had answer'd *ex Cathedra*, that they might: whereas I can find no such Thing. 'Tis true, *Platina* at the End of that *Pope's Life* entertains his *Reader* with many pleasant *Sayings* used by him in common *Conversation*, amongst which this is one. *That there was great Reason for the prohibiting of Priests to marry, but greater for allowing it again.* pag. 401. printed *London*, An. 1688. Now if the same *Pope* in a pleasant *Mood* had said, that *there was great Reason for Prohibiting the Plurality of Wives, but greater for Allowing it again*, it would have been full as good an *Argument* for *Poligamy*, as his other *Saying* is for the *Marriage of Priests*.

§. 44.

Other Objections answer'd.

G. MY Lord, your great Canonist *Panormitan* says, *there is as great Reason to allow Priests to marry now as ever there was to restrain it.* Let *St Bernard* bear *Witness* in his *Time* what *Reason* there was for *Allowing* it, he says, *There are many*

„ who cannot be hid for their Multitude, nor do seek to
 „ be conceal'd for their impudence, who being restrain'd
 „ from the Nuptial Remedies, run into all Filthineß.
 „ Bern. de conv. ad Cler. C. 29. And another says,
 „ that few in those Days were free from Fornication:
 „ Glos. ad Gratian. Dist. 82. C. 5. And Mathew Pa-
 „ ris tells, that the Pope thought it almost a Miracle
 „ that a Candidate for a Bishoprick was said to be
 „ a pure Virgin. Whence the Gloss ad Gratian: in
 „ the Place just before quoted calls Fornication but a
 „ venial Sin; and it is tolerated, if not allow'd. ibid.
 „ Dist. 34. C. 7. However it was reckon'd a less Sin
 „ in a Priest than Marriage. For this Reason deadly
 „ Sin is added to Fornication in our Litany. p. 176.
 „ 177.

L. Sr, as to Mathew Paris's Tale of what a cer-
 tain Pope thought, and Gratian's Saying, that few were
 free from Fornication; I wonder you can lay a Stress
 upon such trifling Stuff. But suppose the Thought of
 the one, and the Saying of the other deserved a se-
 rious Regard, all that can be gather'd from them,
 as likewise from the Words of Panormitan and St
 Bernard is, that in the Time they speak of, there
 was a great Looseness and Corruption amongst the
 Clergy. But do's it suffice to make a Law unreason-
 able, because there are many Transgressors against
 it? If so, I fear the Decalogue will be thought un-
 reasonable too, since Millions transgress daily a-
 gainst it's sacred Laws. I own however there are In-
 conveniences either in allowing or prohibiting the
 Marriage of Priests. But of two Evils the lesser is to
 be chosen. And when our Church is convinced, that
 it is a lesser Evil to allow them to marry, I doubt
 not but she will change her Discipline in this as she
 has sometimes done in other Things.

But your Representing it to be the Doctrine of

our Church, that *Fornication is but a venial Sin*, nay that it is tolerated, if not allow'd by us, is rank Calumny. For tho' there were such a ridiculous Gloss upon *Gratian* a Writer of no Authority amongst us (which however I cannot find, tho' I have read over both the *Distinctions* you refer me to) it will not excuse your slanderous Suggestion, that it is the *Doctrine of our Church*. Nay I am sure you know this to be a Calumny as well as myself. Or if you pretend ignorance, pray examine our Catechisms, or Books of Instruction upon the 6th Commandment, and shew me one if you can, that calls *Fornication a venial Sin*, or says, it is tolerated, if not allow'd.

As to what you add, that *Fornication is reckon'd by our Church a less Sin in a Priest than Marriage*, you utterly mistake the Question in supposing, that our Priests may be truly and validly married, which we deny. For 'tis our Doctrine, that when a Priest pretends to marry, he only makes *Marriage* a Cloak to cover *habitual Sacrilege* and *Adultery*; which doubtless is more grievous, than a Sin casually committed with a single Person.

This is the express Doctrine of *St Chrysostom*, who writes thus to one *Theodore* a fallen Monk, that had married. *Marriage*, (says he) is a just and lawful Thing, I grant it ---- but now it is not a Thing in your Power. For being once join'd to your heavenly Spouse, to leave him, and fall into the Embraces of a Wife, is *Adultery*. Give it a thousand Times if you please the Name of *Marriage*, I say it is as much Worse than *Adultery*, as God is better and greater than *Womankind*. ad Theod. lapsum.

G. But why was *Celibacy* enjoin'd to Priests? « And why is *Marriage* a greater Sin than *Fornica-* «
tion? Because the first is a Breach of the Command

» of the *Church*, and the latter of the Command of
 » *God*. And the Difference of the Punishment of
 » these in your Church shews that she thinks so.
 » For a Priest committing *Fornication* comes off for
 » small Penance, whereas if he *marries*, he is degra-
 » ded. May we not then say to the *Church of Rome*,
 » as Christ to the Church of the Jews in a parallel
 » Case, *full well ye reject the Commandement of God*,
 » *that ye may keep your own Tradition*. Mark. 7. v. 9.
 » pag. 177.

L. Sr, you may say to the *Church of Rome* what-
 ever you please. For who can debarr either you or
 any Body else the Privilege of Talking impertinent-
 ly? But when you speak of the *small Penance* impo-
 sed for the Sin of *Fornication*, you either mean pri-
 vate or publick *Fornication*. If private only, I should
 be glad to know, how you come to be inform'd of
 what passes in the *sacred Tribunal* betwixt our Peni-
 tents and their Confessors. For I never heard of any
 Confessions in our Church cry'd about the Streets,
 as they are on every Execution-day in *London*. But
 if you speak of *Fornication* publickly known, I as-
 sure you Sr, the Party concern'd passes some Part
 of his Days very uncomfortably: and the small Pe-
 nance you speak of is usualy a good long Confinement,
 where he is sometimes regaled with Bread and
 Water; which I believe would not please a *Pro-*
testant Stomach.

But you ask, *why Marriage is a greater Sin than*
Fornication? Sr, true Marriage is no Sin at all, nor
 by Consequence a Breach of God's Command. But
 in a Priest it is no more true Marriage, than it would
 be in a *Layman* to marry a *second Wife*, his former
 being yet alive. Your Reason then why *Marriage*
 in a Priest is a greater Sin than *Fornication* is not on-
 ly false but malicious. For in a *Priest* they are both

against the *Church*, and both against *God*. But with this Difference, that the one may be the Effect of a passing Weakness; and the other cannot but be the Effect of an obstinate and premeditated Lust; which doubtless is more hainous in the Sight of *God*.

G. But, My Lord, if Marriage be such a Defilement, as is unworthy of a Priest, how came you to make a *Sacrament* of it? I suppose you cannot mean less by a *Sacrament* than a *Means of Grace*. You have made many less Things so, as I shew'd before. And would you deprive the Clergy of any Means of Grace? Or is it your Modesty to put them upon the Level with the Laity for depriving them of the Cup in the *Sacrament* of Christ's own Institution? pag. 177. "

L. Sr, I shall answer you very briefly to every Point. First, you ask, if Marriage be such a Defilement as is unworthy of a Priest, how we came to make it a *Sacrament*? Sr, Christ made it a *Sacrament* not we. Nor is true Marriage a Defilement; but the single Life is perfecter, and more becoming a Priest. 2. You say, you suppose we cannot mean less by a *Sacrament* than a means of Grace. That's very true: but you add, we have made many less Things so, as you have shew'd; Both which are false, as I have shew'd. 3. You ask, whether we would deprive the Clergy of any Means of Grace? I answer, the unmarried Clergy stand no more in Need of the Grace annex'd to the *Sacrament* of Marriage, than the married Laity stand in Need of the Grace annex'd to the *Sacrament* of Ordination. Lastly you ask, whether it be our Modesty to put the Clergy upon the Level with the Laity for depriving them of the Cup in the *Sacrament* of Christ's own Institution? I answer, the Laity are deprived of no Part of the Grace or Efficacy of the *Sacrament* of

Christ's Body and Blood: and so your Question is impertinent.

„ *G. Marriage is honourable and undefiled in all,*
 „ says the *Apostle*. No say you, it is neither in a
 „ *Priest*. pag. 178.

L. And you say the very same of all such, as are within the *prohibited Degrees*. Answer it if you can without limiting the Meaning of *Saint Paul's Words*.

„ *G.* He says, *if men cannot contain let them marry,* for it is better to marry than burn. 1. Cor. 7. v. 9.
 „ No, say you, it is better to burn than to marry.
 „ And this you must say, unless you suppose that
 „ all the many Thousands of your Clergy, and
 „ many of them young Men are every one of them
 „ endow'd with the Gift of Continency, which would
 „ be a miracle, if Experience did not contradict it.
 „ pag. 178.

L. Sr, I do not pretend that in such Numbers all are endow'd with the Gift of Continency: yet I am sure all may be, and doubt not but the greatest Part are with the Help of God's Grace. However I hope you are not of *Martin Luther's* Mind, whose admittable Doctrine it is, *that it is impossible either for a Man to live without a Woman, or for a Woman to live without a Man.* (Serm. de Matrim. Tom. 5. Fol. 11.) which me thinks is but a course Compliment to *Batchelors, Maids, and Widows*; of which there are many Thousands even in *Great Britain*. Do all these then, or most of them live in a sinful State? I have the Charity to think they do not: And if they do not, I hope the many Thousands of *Priests and Religious* in our Church may be at least as good as they.

G. But *St Paul* says, *that if Men cannot contain, let them marry.* 1. Cor. 7. v. 9.

L. Pardon

L. Pardon me, sr, St. Paul says no such thing. His Text is falsified in your Bible, & ought to be rendered thus. If they do not contain, let them marry. which still is to be understood of those who may legally embrace the State of Wedlock: for I don't find St. Paul allow'd it to Widows consecrated to God: However there is a large difference between not containing, and not being able to contain. A Thief does not contain from stealing: but I hope he can contain from it if he pleases, tho his fingers itch never so much to do it. So an Adulterer does not contain from coveting his Neighbours Wife; but St. Paul will not tell him that he cannot contain. For if he cannot contain, he cannot be blamed if he does not contain: because Necessity has no Law.

G. I am sure at least St. Paul says, it is better to marry than Burn.

L. Very right sr, and St. Paul teaches nothing but truth. But he does not say it is better to commit Adultery or Sacrilege than Burn. Suppose a man should Burn for his Neighbours Wife, or a marry'd ~~wife~~ man for another woman (the case is not uncommon) does St. Paul tell him, he had better marry her, than Burn for her? No Surely. the Reason is, because marriage is not the only Remedy against the burnings of Concupiscence: But Prayer and mortification join'd with an ardent love of God will have the same Effect, and that in a much nobler way. May St. Paul himself had Recourse to this excellent Remedy instead of marriage against the most violent Buffets of Satan; and he found it most Effectual, as he owns in his Epistles. And this is the very remedy our Clergy and Religious are bound to have recourse to in the like case. So that tho it be better to marry than Burn, when a man can do it lawfully, it is still much better to overcome the

Blessings of Concupiscence by Prayer and mortification, when he has engaged himself in a state that is inconsistent with the Lawfulness of marriage.

» G. My God, all sober Christians, and even Heathens
» look upon marriage as a Preserver, and not as a breaker
» of Chastity. St. Peter calls it a chaste conversation. 1. Pet.
» 3. v. 2 If it were not so we may presume that
» Christ would not have honoured it with his presence
» since and with his first miracle, nor make it
» so frequently, as he do's, the Type and Representation
» of Heaven, and of his Union with the
» Church; calling himself the Bridegroom, and
» her his spouse. pag. 178.

L. S^r, all this is undenyable of true and Lawfull marriage. But tho it be a preserver of Chastity, it is neither the only one, nor an infallible one, nor the best preserver of it. This at least I am sure of that Chastity is not preserved by broken Vows, and sacrilegious Embraces.

» G. The Apostle says, to avoid fornication let every
» man have his own Wife, and every Woman her own
» Husband. 1. Cor. 7. v. 2. No, say you, we except all
» the Clergy, the Fryars, and the Nuns, whom we
» have put under Vows to the contrary. And we
» will find other means for them to obtain the grace
» of Continency. Yes, and the World is full of the
» Effects of those means, and knows whether they
» be better than those of Gods Appointment.
» It is Strange that you, who have so many
» means of grace of your own, should not
» make those very few, which Christ has made,
» stand as he left them. pag. 179

L. S^r, this Grubsteele stuff about our means of grace, and making void the Institutions of Christ has already been repeated and answered so often, that I am perfectly nauseated with it. What S^r! Do's not the Institution of marriage stand as Christ left it, tho St. Paul excluded Widows who had consecrated themselves to God from the Privilege of it, and

the your Church as well as ours forbids it within the prohibited Degrees? and if the Institution of marriage stands as Christ left it notwithstanding these Simulations, can a man of common sense pretend that our excluding the Clergy from the Privilege of it has altered the Institution of God?

Thus, the Apostle says, to avoid fornication let every man have his own wife, and every Woman her own Husband. But does the Apostle, by those words oblige all to marry? Or does he mean that marriage is the only means to avoid fornication? if so, why did he not follow his own Rule and marry? Or if this be his meaning, what opinion must we have of all the Widows and Widowers, Bachelors and Maids of Great Britain?

You say, we except the Clergy, Fryars, and Nuns. This is a terrible grievance indeed. But St. Paul himself has set us the Pattern by accepting Widows, that had consecrated themselves to God. Luther indeed took another course and by the Pleintive of his Power first absolved himself, then as being bound to love his Neighbours as himself, and do by others as he would be done by, absolved both Priests, Fryars and Nuns of all their Vows; who thus became fruitful Fathers and Mothers of Children to propagate his Church.

Alas but we put them under Vows not to marry, and will find other means for them to obtain ~~the~~ the Grace of Continency. So, it is false that we put them under Vows. for there is no force used, but their own free choice determines them to it. And the means we prescribe them

to obtain the Grace of Continency. viz. Retire-
ment, Prayer, mortification, and a serious appli-
cation to the Duty of their respective State, are means pre-
scribed by the Gospel itself; which in spite of your un-
reasonable reflection are never frustrated of their Effect,
when they are rightly used.

I shall conclude this Subject with the words of an Eminent Protestant. A single life (says Mr. Thornike) is a safer way to Perfection than Marriage. So is the profession of the Bergy, and all the means of farther Retirement from the world. ----- And the grace, which our Lord and St. Paul after him owns in them that do this is not a peculiar Favour of the Body obliging him that has it to live single, and him that has it not to marry, but a singular Zeal to Wave that, which God makes lawful for us, that we may the better come to his Kingdom; which when it proceeds from a single Eye proposing to it self nothing in this world but the means of obtaining the world to come; well may we be assured of Gods Help to perform it by Virtue of that Promise, which the common Christianity challenges intending nothing but the Effects of it. Just Weights and measures. Cor. II. pag. 74. 75.

This, Sir, may Help to convince you, that the cause you have so highly maintain'd is not the most honourable, even our Enemies being Judges.

§. 45.

Of Purgatory

” G. But, My Lord, you extend your means
” of Grace farther than Christ did his. For
” he appointed none to be used for those
” in the other World. But you have Offices
” to deliver Souls out of Purgatory. pag.
” 179.

L. Sir, Christ himself has instituted the Holy Sacrament of his Body and Blood,

the use of Prayers, Alms, Fasting &c. and I find no Prohibition in Holy Writ, that forbids the Application of them to the Souls departed. So that our offering them up for the Delivery of Souls out of Purgatory cannot but be a very charitable Office.

C. But it is a very dark one. We have not a word in Scripture of any such State of the dead, where souls are put under pains equal to those of Hell, except for their Duration. pag. 179.

L. nor have we it in any Profession of faith; for all we are bound to believe concerning Purgatory is what the Council of Trent has defined: viz. that there is a Purgatory (or middle State of Souls) and that the Souls detained in it are help'd by the Prayers of the faithful, especially by the acceptable sacrifice of the Altar. But in what manner they are tormented, what sort of place it is, how great their torments are, or how long they are to last; these are points, in which the faith of the Church is not the least concerned, and you only beat the Air, if you dispute against these.

You say, there is not a word in Scripture of any such State. If you mean that the word Purgatory is not in Scripture, I easily grant it. But the Doctrine of Purgatory (as I have shew'd it) is deduc'd by a clear and necessary consequence from several Scriptural Texts.

First, it is said Math. 12. v. 32. that whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him neither in this World, nor in the World to come. Upon which Text St. Austin discourses thus. It would not be truly said of some sins that they shall neither be forgiven in this World, nor in the World to come, unless there were others, which tho' not forgiven in this life, may yet be forgiven in the next: L. 21. de Civ. Dei. c. 24.

2dly, it is said Rom: 11. v. 6. That God will render to every man according to his Deeds. Whence it follows, that if a man dies either without having done worthy fruits of Penitence for sins, of which he has sincerely repented; or with sins which are not deadly, of which he has not repented; since God is infinitely just, and a certain measure of punishment is due to every sin, it follows I say, that he must be punished after his death.

3ly, it is said, Rev. 21. v 27. that no unclean thing shall enter into Heaven. The undenyable consequence whereof is, that a Person guilty of the very smallest sin cannot enter into Heaven, because he is rendered so unclean by it in some degree. Neither can he be damned for it, because nothing but deadly sin is punished with eternal flames. There must therefore be a middle state between Heaven and Hell, where some sins are both punished and expiated; and this we call Purgatory, because in Heaven there is neither punishment nor sins capable of it, and in Hell there is no redemption. Job.

» G. But is not the Blood of Christ sufficient to cleanse us from all Unrighteousness? pag 179.

L. Yes Sir; but if that proves any thing, it will prove a great Deal too much; and Hell will become useless as well as Purgatory.

G. Hold, my Son: the Christ has shed his blood for all, yet he requires a sincere repentance on our part as an indispensable Duty to have it applied to us.

L. Very right, Sir. And therefore as it does not cleanse us of mortal sin without Repentance on our part, so neither of Venial sins but upon the same condition. Besides there may remain a temporal Punishment due to sins, even after we have sincerely repented of them: and if this Debt be not fully discharged in this life, it remains to be paid hereafter.

S. 48.

G. Then the Guilt is not fully forgiven. p. 179. c

L. Pardon me, s^r, there may be a temporal Punishment due for sins, whereof the guilt is fully forgiven. God said to David, I have put away thy sin, but the Sould shall die. 2. Sam. 12.

G. And the Reason is given in the next words, & because by this deed thou hast given great a occasion to the Enemies of the God to blaspheme; as if God did countenance such wickedness. & Therefore David was punished so, as his Enemies might perceive it. God punishes us either to vindicate his own Honour before Men, or for a trial of our faith, as in the case of Job, and to set forth such as Examples to others: or for a Proof and Confirmation of our Religion; as in the case of the Prophets, Apostles, Confessors, and Martyrs: or to correct and recal obstinate Sinners. many have been reformed by this means. But all these Reasons respect this life only. & for you say not that Souls are made better in Purgatory. for you suppose them to die in the love of God, and to be in his favour before they go thither. And why then are they punished, since they are not purified by it? pag. 179. 180. c.

L. s^r, I have hitherto had this Notion of Purgatory, that it is a place, where Souls are purged or purified, and by consequence made better, and fitted for Heaven. But, pray, what Roman Catholicks ever told you the contrary? A Person may in this World love God above all things, and be in his favour. yet I hope this will not hinder him from being made better and purer than he is already: and so he may be made better and purer in Purgatory, by being cleansed from the stains his Soul has contracted by venial offences.

For surely a soul cleansed from all defilements of Sin is purer and better, than whilst she continues tainted with them.

As to the several Reasons, you give, why God visits us with afflictions in this life, they are undeniable but not the only ones. Do kind deserve no Punishment? Must not the Vindicative Justice of God be Satisfied?

» G. That is Satisfied before they are forgiven,
 » and the Sinners received into the favour of God.
 » Unless you mean by Vindictive such a spite and
 » Revenge, as is seen amongst the most ignoble part
 » of Mankind to say, I will forgive, but I will at the
 » same time be revenged for what is past. Which
 » indeed is not forgiveness, but a plain Unwillingness
 » to forgive. pag. 18c.

L. S^r, this is such a blasphemous Imagination as God be praised I never heard of before. Was not Adam's Sin, and the eternal Punishment due to it forgiven him before he dyed? I never heard doubted of by any Body. Yet Heaven was shut against him in Punishment of it till Mankind was redeemed: and God demanded an infinite Satisfaction for it: which was paid to the full by his only Son becoming man, and Dying for us. And is this to be call'd such a Spite and Revenge, as is seen amongst the most ignoble Part of Mankind! for Shame J^r!

» G. My Son, a generous forgiveness upon
 » a Sincere Repentance loves and embraces,
 » and rejoices to comfort, and heap favours
 » like the Father of the returning Prodigal.
 » pag. 18c.

L. And do's not God love and comfort repenting Sinners? And heap spiritual favours upon them, tho he chastises them temporally for their past Sins? 'Tis true, there is no mention of punishment in the parable, you have quoted: because

cause the whole Drift of it is to set forth the Divine Mercies to Sinners that repent sincerely ; And 'tis not necessary that all Truths should be mention'd in all Parts of Scripture.

G. God says, *he will not remember our Sins, that they shall not be mention'd to us in the Day when we turn from our Wickedness.* Isa. 4. v. 25. Jer. 31. v. 34. Ezek. 18. v. 22. And how is that consistent with Enduring the Pains of Hell for a hundred, perhaps a thousand Years for ought we know ? p. 180.

L. Sr, all we know of the Pains of *Purgatory* is, that they are a temporal Punishment justly inflicted ; and a *temporal Punishment* of Sin is as consistent with *Forgiveness*, as God's *Justice* is with his *Mercy*. Thus *Adam's Sin* as soon as he repented of it was not remember'd in the Sense meant by *Isaiah*, *Jeremy*, and *Ezekiel*. That is, God entirely forgave him both the *Guilt* and *eternal Punishment* due to it. Yet the Gates of Heaven were shut for near 4000 Years after in Punishment of it ; And *Adam* himself perform'd the Penance of *Eating his Bread in the Sweat of his Brow* enjoin'd him by God for above 900 Years. In like Manner God forgave *David* as soon as he confess'd his Sin to *Nathan*. But the temporal Punishment of it lasted for many Years after.

G. Yes, My Lord, by Reason of the *Scandal*, as I told you.

L. The *Scandal*, Sr, was a Part of his Sin, and a very considerable Part of it, because it *made the Enemies of the Lord to blaspheme*. Yet tho the whole Sin was forgiven (for God forgives not *by Halves*) that Part of it, as you own yourself, was punish'd for many Years after ; which demonstrates the Falseness of what you said just now, viz. *that the Justice of God is satisfied before the Sins are forgiven, and the Parties concern'd received into Favour.*

» G. But, My Lord, how do we know what
 » Souls go to Purgatory? How long they remain
 » there? And which of them are released? Can
 » Prayers then for the Release of such and such be
 » made *in Faith*? Otherwise they are *Sin* by the *A-*
 » *postle's* determination. pag. 181.

L. I am surpriz'd, Sr, how you can propose your last Question with a serious Countenance. However since you have set me the Example, I shall ask one very like it if you will promise not to laugh at me for it. *viz.* How you can *pray in Faith* for the Safety of an absent Friend, who you know not whether he be alive or dead? Will not this also be a *Sin* by *St Paul's Determination*? Yes surely full as hainous a one as our Praying for Souls, whose State we know nothing of. But I should rather think that tho such Prayers have not always their Effect as to the Parties we pray for, they who offer them up will not be deprived of the Reward of their pious and Charitable Intention.

» G. Yes, My Lord, all *Superstition* is very pious,
 » and that is it which deceives. But God has requi-
 » red that our zeal to him be according to *knowledge*,
 » and that we intrude not into Things we have not
 » seen. We have not seen any *Revelation* for *Purga-*
 » *tory* or the State of Souls there. pag. 181.

L. Sr, they who will not see, will not see; and are blind not for Want of Eyes, but for Want of *Will* to use them. I have already quoted Texts of *Scripture* enough, wherein the *Revelation* of *Purgatory* is as clearly to be seen as a Consequence in it's Principle. And so it is neither *Superstition* nor *Zeal contrary to Knowledge* to pray for the Relief of Souls supposed to be in that State of Suffering. But besides it's Foundation in *Scriptures* it has as uninter-
 » rrupted a *Tradition* on it's Side as any Article of

Faith ; as I shall shew before we have done with this Subject.

§. 46.

Of Tradition.

G. **M**Y Lord , there are *good and bad Traditions* , and they are much oftner taken in the bad Sense throughout the New Testament. *Ye have made the Commandement of God of no Effect by your Tradition.* Math. 17. v. 6. *Holding the Tradition of the Elders.* Mark. 7. v. 3. *Laying aside the Commandement of God , that ye may keep your own Tradition.* v. 9. *Vain Deceit after the Tradition of Men.* Coll. 2. v. 8. *Your vain Conversation received by Tradition from your Fathers , &c.* Pet. 1. v. 18. pag. 181. "

L. Sr , all these Texts prove very solidly what you said first , viz. *that there are both good and bad Traditions.* But are *Apostolical Traditions* in the Number of *bad ones* ? St Paul thought not. Therefore (says he) *Brethren stand fast , and hold the Traditions , which you have been taught whether by Word or our Epistle.* 2. Thess. 2. v. 15. This , Sr , was St Paul's Doctrine to the *Thessalonians*. And I presume it regarded not them alone , but the whole *Church of Christ* both then and in after-ages. I am sure the holy Fathers understood it so. Hear what St *Irenæus* says. *Suppose (says he) the Apostles had left us no Scriptures , ought we not to have follow'd the Rule of Tradition , which they deliver'd to them to whose Care they committed the Churches ?* L. 3. C. 3.

G. It seems then that *Tradition* has the same Authority with you as the *Scripture* itself.

L. Sr , if you speak of *Tradition* derived from *Christ* and his *Apostles* , it has so : and St Paul is my Voucher for it. Nay whosoever will give himself

Leisure to think must be of the same Mind. Because whatever *Christ* and his *Apostles* taught by *Word of Mouth* was without all Dispute as truly the *Word of God*, as what the *Apostles* have deliver'd to us in their *Writings*. So that tho *Scriptures* rightly understood be a *Rule of Faith* to the Church, yet since *Christ* laid the Foundation of it by Preaching only, and the *Apostles* preach'd several Years before they wrote any of the *Canonical Books*, it follows that the *unwritten Word* was the first Rule of Christian Belief, which could not lose it's Authority by the After-writing of the *Apostles*.

G. My Lord, all that the *Apostles* taught by *Word of Mouth* was afterwards set down in the *Canonical Books*.

L. Pray what Authority either of *Scripture* or *Fathers* have you for this? *St Chrysostom* is positive for the Contrary. *It is clear*, says he, *that the Apostles did not deliver all Things in Writing, but many Things without it: and These too deserve to be believed. Let us then give Credit to the Tradition of the Church. 'Tis Tradition, seek no farther.* L. de Spirit. Sancto. C. 29.

St Epiphanius says the same. *Tradition too* (says he) *is necessary. For all Things cannot be had from the Scripture. Therefore the Blessed Apostles left some Things in Writing, and others by Tradition.* Thus *St Epiphanius*. Hæc. 61. Nay *St Paul* himself directed the *Thessalonians* to the *unwritten Word*, as has been shew'd; and in the only Epistle he wrote to the *Galatians* he refers them to what he had taught them by *Word of Mouth*. Tho we, says he, or an *Angel from Heaven* preach any other Gospel unto you, than that which we have preach'd unto you, let him be accursed. Gal. i. v. 8.

G. My Lord, there is a *Tradition*, which for the Evidence of it we are willing to admit. That is, according to the Rule of *Vincentius, Lirinensis*,

that which was always received, every where, and by *all*. And we are willing to join Issue with you upon *this Tradition as to Purgatory, that is, universal Tradition*. And you would not desire we should be *convinced by any particular Tradition of this or that Church or Place*. For you know there are *many Deceits in such*. pag. 181. 182. "

L. Sr, if I don't mistake your Meaning, the *universal Tradition* upon which you are willing to join issue with us is of so large a Size, that not one single Article of the *Creed* can come up to it. For every Article of it, particularly that of the *Divinity of Christ*, has been denied by *many*. It has not therefore been received by *All*. And since those Many had a Being in *some Time*, and in *some Place*, it has not been received *always*, and *every where*. You may therefore safely join issue with me even as to *Purgatory* upon this pretty Notion of *universal Tradition* without Approaching one Step nearer to it. For *Aerius* an *ancient Reformer* in the 4th Century denied it, and was writ against by the Fathers of that and the following Age; and you yourself, who deny it now, are *somebody*, and existent in *some Time* and *Place*; which I suppose suffices to prove that it has not been received *always, every where, and by All*.

But to be more serious upon the Matter, those Truths are said to have an *universal Tradition*, even according to the true Meaning of *Vincentius Lirinensis*, which tho they have been or are still opposed by *Hereticks*, are derived from the *Apostles* themselves, and have been always acknowledg'd as such by the *Catholick Church* and all true Members of it throughout the whole *World*: which *Vincentius Lirinensis* calls *being received always, every where, and by All*. And this *universal Tradition* we have for *Purgatory*, tho not the chimerical one upon which I pre-

sume you are willing to join Issue with us.

» G. My Lord, *Veron* in his *Rule of Faith* (a Book
 » much applauded in *France*, and put into *English*
 » for the Use of *Roman Catholicks* here) sets out in
 » the Beginning with a Definition of the Rule of
 » Faith, of which he makes the first Requisite to be
 » for an Article of Faith, *that it be clearly reveal'd in*
 » *Scripture* (and by no pretended *Revelation* to any
 » whatsoever) *in exprefs Words*, or thence to be de-
 » duced by necessary Consequence. Which when
 » made appear as to *Purgatory* or any other Doc-
 » trines in Dispute, we shall readily allow it; and
 » till then we cannot be arraign'd of *Herefy* for not
 » Professing to believe it.

» This *Intruding into Things we have not seen pro-*
 » *ceeds*, as the *Apostle* observes Col. 2. v. 18. from a
 » *fleshy Mind* measuring *spiritual* Things by *carnal*.
 » We see it takes Time to purge the Flesh of Di-
 » seases and Defilements it has contracted. And it
 » takes a great Deal of Filing and Scrubbing to
 » cleanse iron, that has been long rusted. Hence
 » you conjecture the same as to Souls depar-
 » ted, that they must be purged by *Fire*. But the
 » Work of God upon the *Soul* when he grants
 » true Repentance, operates far otherwise. It ef-
 » fects the Cure all at once, as with those who
 » look'd upon the *brazen Serpent*. Our Saviour him-
 » self makes the Comparifon. *Job*. 3. v. 14. 15. And
 » he gave us an Example of it in the Thief upon
 » the Cross, who was translated to Paradise the same
 » Day he died: and yet he had been a grievous Sin-
 » ner, and suffer'd justly for his Offences. His Re-
 » pentance was late, and he had made no Restitu-
 » tion: yet he did no Penance in *Purgatory*. pag. 182.
 » 183.

§. 47.

The Subject of Purgatory resumed.

L. SR, according to your laudable Custom you have made some commodious Alterations in *Veron's Words*. For his true Words are these [English'd by E. S. Esq. Parif. Ann. 1660. pag. 1.] *the total and only Rule of the Catholick Faith is Divine Revelation deliver'd to the Prophets and Apostles*, PROPOSED BY THE CATHOLICK CHURCH in her general Councils, or by her universal Practise to be believed as an Article of Catholick Faith. And pray, Sr, is it the same Thing to be reveal'd to the Apostles, and to be clearly written by them? Did they write every Thing that was reveal'd to them? The contrary is most certain, as has been fully shew'd. So that if *Veron* had set out with the Definition of his Rule of Faith, as you have cook'd it for him, instead of being applauded as he now is, he would have been condemn'd for an *Heretick*.

However suppose you had made no Change in his Words, you would be bound to believe the Doctrine of Purgatory according to the latter Part of his Rule, as quoted by you. Because the Doctrine of Purgatory is deduced by a necessary Consequence from several Texts of Scripture, as I have fully proved.

You say, *Souls are not gradually cured like Bodies but all at once, when God grants true Grace and Repentance*. Sr, if you mean that the Guilt of mortal or venial Sin is not pardon'd by Halves but all at once: Or, that when a Soul is tainted with many mortal Sins, one cannot be pardon'd without the other: Or finally, that God conveys a Soul in an Instant from the State of Sin to that of sanctifying Grace, what you

say is very true, but nothing to your Purpose. Because, when the whole *Guilt* of Sin is pardon'd, the *temporal Punishment* is not always remitted with it, as has been proved to a Demonstration. And if the Divine Justice be not fully satisfied in this Life, there must be a State in the Life to come wherein full Satisfaction may be made, and the Debt that has been contracted *paid to the last Farthing*.

Besides a Soul cleansed from the Guilt of mortal Sin may still be stain'd with many lesser Offences or even Affections to 'em, which are all Blemishes and must be wash'd off before she can be admitted into Heaven, where nothing that is unclean can enter. And where then will you find in *Scripture* or indeed any where but in your own Imagination, that all Souls are perfectly cured in a Trice, and stand in no Need of having their Cure perfected hereafter? This indeed is properly *Intruding into Things we have not seen*.

You mention the *brazen Serpent*; at the Sight whereof Bodies were cured; and you add, *that Christ himself made the Comparison*. So he did; but the Comparison he made is this. viz. *That as Moses lifted up the Serpent in the Wilderness, even so must the Son of Man shall be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him may not perish, but have Life everlasting*. Joh. 3. & 14. 15: **W**hence you conclude, *Therefore all Souls are perfectly cured at once*. Is not this Trifling with the **W**ords of Christ instead of Treating them with a serious Regard to their true Meaning.

But the *Thief* on the Cross, *tho he had been a grievous Sinner, and repented late, and made no Restitution, yet (say you) he did no Penance in Purgatory*. I hope, *St*, you don't mean this as an *innuendo*, that the *Way* to go strait to Heaven is to *sin grievously, repent late, and make no Restitution*. But let that pass: *whosoever*

whoſoever ſuffers as much, and with the ſame *Hu-
mility, Patience, Reſignation, Faith, and Zeal* as the
good Thief did on the Croſs, needs not be afraid of
Purgatory. But I fear there are but few Death-bed
Penitents in the *World* like him.

G. My Lord, it is more than we know whe-
ther he might not have been converted before. "
But however it ſhews there is no neceſſity of *Pur-
gatory* even for very great Offenders. *pag. 183.* "

L. Very true, Sr, not for any Offenders, that
become ſuch Penitents as the good Thief was.

ADVERTISEMENT.

To theſe laſt Words of the Gentleman in his Caſe
ſtated his Lordſhip gives this childish Answer.
No doubt but God may excuſe whom he
pleaſes. *To which the Gentleman replies thus.*

G. How then do we know whom he excuſes "
and whom not? And how can we pray *in Faith*, "
that is, *without Sin* to deliver ſuch a particular Per- "
ſon from *Purgatory*? *pag. 183.* "

L. In the ſame Manner, Sr, as you pray *in Faith*
and *without Sin* for the Safety of a Friend in the
Army or at *Sea*, who you know not whether he be
alive or Dead.

As to your Queſtion, *how we know whom God ex-
cuſes and whom not?* Sr, God might have forgiven
if he had pleaſed all our Sins without ſubjecting
us to any temporal Punishment for them. But this
is not the Order his infinite Wiſdom has eſtabliſh'd.
And therefore, as he excuſes no Sinner from *Re-
pentance*, ſo he excuſes none that we know from
Doing worthy Fruits of Penance: and Punishing our
Sins is one of thoſe *worthy Fruits*. Which if we have

not fully perform'd in this Life, the Deficiency must be made good in the next.

» G. But if there was no Necessity of *Purgatory*,
 » as you have granted, in the Case of the *Thief*,
 » how is it to be imagined that God should keep
 » so many thousand Souls for many Years and Ages
 » in the most extreme Torments, when there is no
 » Necessity for it? *pag. 183.*

L. Sr, neither you nor I can know, how long Souls are detain'd in *Purgatory*. But there is always a Necessity that God's Will be accomplish'd, and we are very sure that none are punish'd longer than they deserve. And the Reason why the good Thief had no *Purgatory* was, because the *Divine Justice* was satisfy'd before he died: and if all died as he did, the Necessity of *Purgatory* would cease.

» G. My Lord, if the *Pope* has Power to release
 » out of *Purgatory*, he must be a very cruel Father,
 » who keeps one Soul there an Hour longer.
 » *pag. 183.*

L. You may as well call him a very cruel Father for not hindring *Plagues, Wars, Famines, Hurricans, Earthquakes*, and other such Punishments of Sin. Sr, there are about twenty Reasons more or less, why the *Pope* do's not release all Souls out of *Purgatory*. And the first of these Reasons is, because he *cannot*. For if he could, he certainly would do it. I omit the rest for Brevity Sake.

But has it not been the Discipline of the Church in all Ages to impose Penances for Sins by the Power of the keys? And are then all her Bishops and Pastors cruel Fathers for not Remitting the *Penalty* together with the *Guilt*? Are they not the Ministers of God's *Justice* as well as *Mercy*? Or do they not act by Commission from him?

» G. My Lord, the Church knows not the Heart,

and must Judge by outward Signs, which yet secure not from Hypocrisy. But this is all foreign to God, who searches the Heart, and knows all that is in Man. pag. 184. "

L. But as the Church can absolve from *Sins* without an infallible knowledge of the Disposition of Men's Hearts, why might she not also without that infallible knowledge absolve them from all *Penalty* whatsoever, were she not certain that in so Doing she would act contrary to the *Order* establish'd by God; So that 'tis manifest it always was the Church's Faith, that there is a *temporal* Punishment due to Sin even after the *Guilt* together with the *eternal* Punishment is remitted,

G. My Lord, tho our Physick of Discipline Works by Degrees, and the Issue is uncertain, yet God never cures imperfectly. *Christ* never half-heald any Man. And so it is when he pardons Sinners. *Thy Sins are forgiven thee*, it is not said shall be forgiven, or when thou hast perform'd such or such a Penance; but the Forgiveness of his Sins was as immediately wrought as the Cure of his Body. And God gives us all the Assurances that can be in the strongest Expressions of our Sins being absolutely and totally forgiven. As being all blotted out, and cast into the Depths of the Sea. Never to be remember'd or mention'd unto us any more, as before quoted. *I will heal their Backsliding, I will love thee freely. He is ready to forgive, he waiteth to have mercy, he earnestly remembreth, his Bowels are troubled for Sinners, that they may repent; and in the Day they turn from their Wickedness he forgiveth. For he doth not afflict willingly, nor grieve the Children of Man.* It is for their Repentance and Reformation. But this Consideration is not in *Purgatory*. p. 184. 185. "

L. What a strange Profusion of Texts have we here again to no Manner of Purpose ! Any one of them suffices to prove that the *Guilt of Sin* with the *eternal Punishment* due to it is never pardon'd imperfectly or *by Halves* , and a thousand of them can prove no more. Why then are they thus multiplied but for a Shew to impose upon the Ignorant. Hear what St *Austin* says concerning the temporal Punishment of Sin after the Guilt is pardon'd. *The Punishment of Sin*, says he, *continues after the Guilt is pardon'd least the Guilt should be thought little , if the Punishment ended with it.* Trac. 124. in *Joanem*. Hence it is even conducing to our Salvation, that God do's not always remit at once both the temporal and eternal Punishment : that we may feel sensibly the Effects both of his *Mercy* and *Justice* , and not abuse by repeated Crimes the Facility of his Pardon : as St *Austin* also observes upon the 8th Verse of the 50th Psalm.

§ 48.

Of Merits.

“ G. **B**Ut, My Lord, how will the poor Souls in
 “ *Purgatory* (if any be there) be deluded,
 “ if the Stock of *Supererogation* should fail them,
 “ that is, the *Merits* of *Saints* for their good *Works*,
 “ which they have done over and above their Duty,
 “ and what they were obliged to for their Salvati-
 “ on; and therefore are applied to others, who have
 “ come short of their Duty to supply their Defi-
 “ ciencies, which is the *Fund* provided for the Dis-
 “ charge of Prisoners out of *Purgatory*? and this is
 “ dispended by the *Pope* to whom he thinks fit, as
 “ being the grand *Treasurer* of the Church, and con-
 “ sequently of those superabundant *Merits* of the

Saints. But we want a *Text*, where St *Peter* was “ constituted such a *Treasurer*, or that there is or “ can be such a *Treasury*. pag. 185. “

L. Sr, I am as much a Stranger to any such Text as yourself. And as I am not bound in a Dispute about Religion to maintain meer *School-Opinions*, in which the Church's Faith is not concern'd, so neither am I bound to produce any *Scripture-Texts* for them. However thus far is certain, that the *Saints* pray for all their Fellow-members who stand in Need of it; and their Prayers are acceptable to God, and available in Behalf of those they pray for in proportion to the Degree of Holiness, they attained to in this Life. And in this Sense their past *Merits* and *Sufferings* may be said to be applicable to others: viz. in as much as they give an Efficacy to their Prayers to move God to have Compassion on those they pray for: As the Prayer of *Moses* appeased God's Wrath against the *Israelits*; and as *Job's* Praying for his three Friends had the same Effect. And finally, as the Prayers and Extraordinary Mortifications of God's special Servants upon Earth often move him to bestow the Grace of a sincere Conversion on Sinners, who deserve nothing but to be abandon'd by him.

But since the *Merits* and *Prayers* of God's Saints either in Heaven or on Earth have no other Value, than what they derive from the *Merits of Christ*, I must here bring you acquainted with a Fund for the Discharge of the *Prisoners in Purgatory*, which I presume you will not venture to burlesque for your Diversion. I mean, the infinite Price of the sacred Blood of *Christ*, and the inexhaustible Treasure of his *Merits*: which Fund I hope is secure, and in no Danger of Failing. So that your mighty Concern least the poor Souls in *Purgatory* should find themselves

left in the Lurch, if their Stock of Supererogation should fail them, is wholly owing either to your real, or affected Misunderstanding of the most essential Part of our Doctrine. For it cannot be doubted, but that the infinite Merits and Satisfaction of Christ will always be a sufficient Fund to release the Prisoners.

But I know not, whether I must ascribe it to a Want of Charity, or Judgment, or both; when you express our Doctrine of Merit and Supererogation in these improper and equivocal Terms, viz. that the Saints are obliged for their Salvation to the Merits of their own good Works, which they have done over and above their Duty. Every Word whereof carries a double Meaning; but the bad one is uppermost, and offers itself at first Sight.

Wherefore to prevent all Mistakes, I desire you to observe, that it is our Doctrine that all, who are saved, owe their Salvation (if we will speak properly) purely to the Mercy and Grace of God through the infinite Merits and Mediation of Jesus-Christ. First, because no Man can merit the first justifying Grace: as is expressly taught by the Council of Trent in the following Words. 'Tis therefore said, that we are justified gratis, because none of the Acts which precede Justification, whether they be Faith, or good Works, can merit this Grace. Sess. 6. C. 6. As therefore we owe that which is the Groundwork and Foundation of our eternal Happiness to the pure Liberality of God, so are we by Consequence indebted to him for that Happiness, which cannot be attain'd without it.

2dly, tho the Virtues which we practise, and the good Works which we perform in the State of Grace be most certainly conducing to Salvation, and even merit an Increase of Grace, yet since those very Virtues and good Works are not only the

Gifts of God, but derive all the Merit they have from his *sanctifying Grace* and the *Merits of Christ*, it follows, that we have the same Obligation to God for our eternal Happiness, as if he bestow'd it upon us without any Concurrence or Cooperation on our Part. Nay our Obligation is rather the greater, because that very *Concurrence* or *Cooperation* on our Part is an additional Favour we receive of him, and so entirely the Fruit of his holy Grace, that we cannot (independently of it) without Presumption ascribe it to ourselves according to these Words of St Paul; *What hast thou that thou didst not receive? and if thou didst receive it, why dost thou glory, as if thou hadst not received it?* 1. Cor. 4. v. 7. and again, *For it is God, who worketh in us both to will and to do of his good Pleasure.* Philip. 2. v. 13.

Yet all this notwithstanding it is undoubtedly true, that our Salvation depends upon the Practice of Virtue and good Works: because the Word of God declares positively, that we cannot be saved without it. *If thou wilt enter into Life, keep the Commandments.* says Christ, Math. 19. v. 17. and St James tells us, that *Faith if it hath not Works is dead.* James 2. v. 17. If then we cannot be saved without keeping the Commandments and the Practice of good Works, our Salvation is Owing to it in the same Sense as it depends upon it. Nor do's this derogate in the least from the Glory due to God: because Owing our Salvation to the *Virtues* and *good Works* we practise is in Effect Owing it to the *Gifts of God*: because we can neither practise any Virtue, nor perform any good Work without the Assistance of his Grace, *who worketh in us both to will, and to do of his good Pleasure.* Philip. 2. v. 13.

G. But, My Lord, how do's all this consist with your Doctrine of *Merits*?

L. Not at all ; Sr, as *Protestants* will needs understand it for us : but as we understand it nothing is more easy. I shall therefore explain it briefly to you. The *Council of Trent* speaks thus of it. *To those, who place their Confidence in God, and continue in the Practice of good Works, eternal Life ought to be proposed both as a Grace mercifully promised to the Children of God through Jesus-Christ, and as a Reward faithfully to be render'd by Virtue of that Promise to their good Works and Merits.* Sess. 6. C. 16.

Here is all that is of Faith relating to the Article of *Merit* ; concerning which *Protestants* have taken the utmost Pains to poison the People with false Notions of our Doctrine. And I do not wonder at it. Because Mistrating a Doctrine is the most expedite Way to confute it. For it costs no Labour of the Brain ; but with a little Pliableness of Conscience makes Truth and Falsehood shift Sides in a Trice. I shall put a Question or two to clear the Matter. Pray, Sr, has not God promised *eternal Life* to such as perform the Conditions required of them ?

G. Who doubts it ?

L. And is not this a *Covenant*, or a kind of *Contract* or *Bargain* betwixt God and Man ?

G. I cannot deny it.

L. Well, and are not all *Contracts* or *Bargains* binding on both Sides, so that if the Conditions stipulated be perform'd by the one, the other is bound to make good his Part ? I am sensible this Question presses somewhat hard upon you. For it follows from it, that if we perform our Part of the *Covenant* God has made with us, we deserve the promised Reward, and have a *just Title* to it by Virtue of his *Promise*. And this is that frightful Bugbear, which we call *Merits*.

G. But, My Lord, are our Works then in this Life equal to the Reward ?

L. No,

L. No, Sr, they are not *equal* to it. Nay tho we did ten thousand Times more, they would bear no Proportion to it: because God has been so bountiful as to promise a Reward infinitely surpassing our Works. But still they are a *Reward*, and a Reward *promised* upon such and such Conditions, as he thought fit to impose. And if God's sacred Promise be sufficient to ground a sure and just Title, they who perform the Conditions upon which Heaven is promised, have the surest and justest Title to it, that a Man can have to any Thing.

G. But do's not *Christ* say, that *when we have done all we are commanded, we are unprofitable Servants?* Luke 17. v. 10. and how then can we pretend to any *Merits*, or *Works of Supererogation?*

L. Sr, when we *have done all we are commanded*, we are wholly *unprofitable to God*: for he cannot receive any Profit by us. Neither do's he stand in Need of his Servants, but his Servants stand in Need of him. Yet since we are his *Servants*, when we have done what we are commanded, we have a Title to the *Wages* he has promised us. For a *Covenant*, *Contract*, or *Bargain* holds between God and Man, as well as between Man and Man. And God who is just will certainly pay us our *Wages* according to the *Work* we have done.

But we are over and above *unprofitable Servants* in another Sense even when we have done all we are commanded. Because we are *insufficient of ourselves even to think any Thing as of ourselves, but our Sufficiency is of God.* 2. Cor. 3. v. 5. So that we can do nothing of what we are commanded in Order to Salvation, unless we be enabled by God's Grace to do it. And can any Thing be more unprofitable than a Servant, that can do nothing without the Help of his Master?

Hence St *Austin* has left us these excellent Words, which contain a full Defence of the Doctrine of *Merits*, and shew what the Church's Faith was in his Time. *Eternal Life* (says he) *is call'd by the Apostle the Gift of God.* NOT THAT IT IS NOT GIVEN TO MERITS, BUT BECAUSE THE MERITS THEMSELVES, TO WHICH IT IS GIVEN, are likewise his Gifts. And again. *When God crowns our Merits, what else do's he crown but his own Gifts?* L. de gratia & lib. Arb. and so we are always *unprofitable Servants.*

Neither is this inconsistent with what we call Works of *Supererogation*, if you will but vouchsafe to understand the Word as we do. A Question or two will lead us to the true Meaning of it. I ask then, whether there be not *Counsels* as well as *Precepts*!

G. Who doubts it?

L. Well, Sr, and are we bound in Conscience to practise the *Evangelical Counsels*? Are we bound, for Example, to *sell all we have and give it to the Poor*?

G. No surely.

L. He then that practises this or any other *Evangelical Counsel*, do's a Work of *Supererogation*. That is, he do's a Thing he is not bound to do. And this is precisely our Meaning of that Word. But if you fix another Meaning upon it, and tell the People, that we pretend to do all we are commanded and more, i. e. to be wholly free from Sin, I must accuse you either of Ignorance, or wilful Slander. For we utterly deny it, as being contrary to God's Word which tells us, that in many Things we all offend James 3. v. 2. And, that if we say we have no Sin we deceive ourselves, and the Truth is not in us. 1. Joh. 1. v. 8. Now Sr you may put what Objections you please.

§. 49.

Objections answer'd.

G. **M**Y Lord, can a Creature merit at the « Hands of God for ever so great Endow- « ments bestow'd upon him? Is it a *Merit* to receive « great Gifts? *pag. 185. «*

L. Sr, God can reward nothing but *his own Gifts*. But since he has promised to reward them, they certainly deserve their Reward in Virtue of that *Promise*, and must by Consequence be a *Merit* in his Sight. Which made *St Austin* say, that *God has made himself a Debtor to us not by Receiving, but by Promising*. *Psal. 83.* You ask, *if it be a Merit to receive great Gifts?* I answer it is no *Merit*, if we abuse them. But to employ as we ought the *Gifts* we receive, is certainly a *Merit* through God's Goodness, who has promised to reward them.

G. But if we employ them to the best Advan- « tage, is it more than is our Duty to do? *pag. 185. «*

L. No, Sr, but God rewards his Servants for Doing their Duty, and we merit Heaven by it.

G. And we are still *unprofitable Servant*, as *Christ* « himself has told us. *pag. 185. «*

L. We are so. But still we are *Servants*, and work for *Wages*. And the *Wages* promised us is *eternal Life*.

G. But was there ever a Man (*Christ* alone ex- « cepted) *who did all his Duty?* Are not all *Sinners?* « And if their Repentance entitles them to Pardon, « this is far from *Merit*: my Doing my Duty to « Day makes no Amends for my having neglected « it Yesterday. *pag. 185. 186. «*

L. Sr, you seem to make no Difference between

venial Offences, and *deadly Sin*. This deprives us of *Sanctifying Grace*, which constitutes us the *adoptive Sons of God*, his *Heirs* and *Coheirs of Christ*; and is the interior Foundation of *Merit* in the Soul, to which God has promised *eternal Life*, and an Increase of *Glory* in Proportion to the meritorious *Works*, whereof it is the Source and Principle through the *Merits of Jesus-Christ*. But *venial Offences* destroy not this Foundation; tho they suffice to denominate all Men *Sinners*, even the greatest *Saints*, who *all offend in many Things*. James 3. 8. And so your Questions are fully answer'd. And it is manifest, that tho all be *Sinners* in the Sense meant by St James, yet this hinders not, but that there are many, who being free from *deadly Sin* are properly call'd *just* or *righteous* according to *Scripture-language*: and these are in a State of *Meriting* the Pardon of their *daily Failings*, and Attoning or *Making Amends* for them by the Practice of good *Works* join'd with Repentance.

G. We find the greatest *Saints* applying to the Mercy of God, and not pleading their own *Merits*. Jacob said, *I am not worthy of the least of all thy Mercies*. And Job, who had none like him in the Earth, a perfect and upright Man, &c. said *I abhor myself, and repent in Dust and Ashes*. And Daniel the Man greatly beloved, confess'd his own Sins as well as the Sins of the People. And St Paul call'd himself the *Chief of Sinners*, not worthy to be an *Apostle*. pag. 186.

L. What Wonder is it, that the *Saints* on Earth (who had the deepest Sense of their own natural Corruption, and the Offences they had committed against God) both thought and spoke thus humbly of themselves? For they would not have been *Saints* without it; and their Humility was their *brightest*

Merit, and a most special *Gift of God*. Nay they would have acted very presumptuously, had they pleaded their own *Merits*, and not applied themselves to the *Mercy of God*. 1. because no Man knows what *Merits* he has, or whether he be worthy of God's *Love* or *Hatred*. and 2dly, because all *Merits* are the *Mercies* and *Gifts* of God through *Jesus-Christ*.

G. But if the *Saints* own no *Merit* in themselves, " then surely they will disown all those, who apply " to their *Merits*: and as I said before concerning " the *Worship* and *Invocation* of them, by which you " hope to gain them to be *Intercessors* for you they " must become your *Accusers* by the Denial of their " Acceptance of such *Worship* from you, which if " they should accept, it would make them *evil Spi-* " *rits*, as I have quoted out *St Austin*. pag. 186. "

L. Sr, the *Saints* on Earth see nothing of their own *Merits*. Their *Humility* is industrious to hide every Thing from them but their *Faults*. But in Heaven, where there is no Danger of *Vanity*, they are happy in the experimental knowledge of their past *Virtues* and *Merits* by the Degree of *Glory*, whereof they are securely in Possession: and therefore we need not fear their Displeasure by our Honouring those *Merits*, which have raised them to that *Glory*: especially since they are not ignorant, that Honouring their *Merit* is but Honouring the *Gifts of God*.

But, Sr, as to your Quotation from *St Austin* against our Honouring and Invoking the *Saints*, I am sorry you give me so often Occasion to reproach you with your shameful Falsification of that Father. For it obliges me to an ungrateful Task; and I blush for you as often as I am forced to do it.

G. But, My Lord, what Creature dares plead a Purity before God? Behold he chargeth his Angels &

» with Folly, and he putteth no Trust in his Saints. Yea
 » the Heavens are not clean in his Sight. How much
 » more abominable and filthy is Man, who drinketh ini-
 » quity like Water? And what is Man, that he should
 » be clean? And he that is born of a Woman, that
 » he should be righteous? Job. 4. v. 18. And if all our
 » Righteousnesses are as filthy Rags. Isa. 44. v. 6. If there
 » be Iniquity in our holy Things, in the holy Sanctuary
 » and Altar, what then is clean? pag. 186. 187.

L. Sr, your first Question is, what Creature dares
 plead Purity before God? And all the Texts you have
 produced are to prove, that no Man can without
 Presumption make this Plea: which I readily grant.
 Because we all offend in many Things. But amongst those
 who offend in many Things, it is to be hoped there
 are many who do not offend God mortally. And these
 are in a State of Meriting the Reward, which God
 promised to those, who live and die in his holy
 Grace. Nay you own'd just now that Job was a per-
 fect and upright Man. So that all that can be con-
 cluded from the Texts you have quoted is that Man
 of himself, and without the Grace of Jesus-Christ is
 nothing but Weakness, Corruption, and Sin.

» G. My Lord, if the righteous themselves shall scarce-
 » ly be saved, as St Peter tells us Ch. 4. v. 18. what
 » Merits have they to spare for others, especially
 » when they are not saved even by their own
 » Works? For by Grace ye are saved, not by Works,
 » least any Man should boast. Eph. 2. v. 8. 9. Can any
 » Man then boast of his Works as not only suffi-
 » cient for his own Salvation, but over and above
 » as meritorious to be applied to others, and to de-
 » liver Souls out of Purgatory? No, My Lord, the
 » Saints make no such boasts, and will disown all
 » those, who make them in their Name. For they
 » know that all have sinned, and come short of the Glory

§. 49.

of God being justified freely by his Grace through the *Redemption that is in Jesus-Christ* ----- *Where is a Boasting then? It is excluded. By what Law? Of Works? Nay, but by the Law of Faith. Rom. 3. v. 23. 24. 27. pag. 187. "*

L. Really, Sr, one would think you had read the Scripture for nothing else, but to misapply and abuse it. Your first Text from *St Peter* speaks of the Difficulty of being saved, and the Severity of God's Judgment; which no Man surely doubts of. Yet for all that, 'tis certain the *Saints* are saved; and it is no less certain, that the *Virtues* and *good Works*, which through *God's Grace* they have practised in this Life, were a Means to bring them to that happy State. Unless you will say, that *good Works* are not necessary nor conducing to Salvation: which I presume is not the Doctrine of your Church.

The Subject of the whole Chapter to the *Ephesians* whence you have taken your second Text, is to render them sensible, that their being converted from *Idolatry* to the *Faith of Christ* was not in the least Owing to any preceding Merit of good Works, but wholly to the *Goodness of God*, and the *Grace and Merits of Jesus Christ*. And is not this wonderfully to the Purpose? Your argument runs thus. *Idolaters wallowing in all Sorts of Sins do not merit the Grace of their Conversion*, therefore *Christians that live well, do not deserve to go Heaven*. Fine Stuff indeed!

Your third Text from *St Paul* to the *Romans* is immediately follow'd by these Words. *Therefore we conclude, that a Man is justified by Faith without the Deeds of the Law. v. 28.* Which shews that the Apostle's main Scope in that Chapter was to convince the converted *Jews at Rome*, that they were to be saved not by the *Works of the Law*, but by their *Faith in Jesus-Christ*. And that therefore they had no

Reason to *boast* ; as they did , of the *Works* of the Law. But do's *Faith in Christ* exclude the necessity of good *Works*?

G. But can a Man then *boast* of his good *Works*? I believe the *Saints* make no such Boast, nor desire others to make it for them.

L. St , no Man can boast of his good *Works* or *Merits* , let them be never so great: *But he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord* , says St Paul 2. Cor. 10. §. 7. because all *Merits* are the *Gifts of God* : and when God crowns our *Merits* , he only rewards his own *Gifts* : as St *Austin* has already told us. So that I am wholly of your Mind , that the *Saints* make no such Boasts. Nor do I know any who make them in their Name: tho we all praise God in his *Saints* ; as we are directed by the *Psalmist*. Psal. 150. §. 1. And desire them to intercede both for ourselves and the Souls departed ; not doubting but their past *Merits* render their Prayers acceptable to God , and available for the Relief of others. But that the *Saints* have any *Merits* to spare , or that their *Merits* are applicable to others any other Way than that of *Intercession* or *Impetration* , as I have explain'd it , is a Doctrine I am utterly a stranger to.

» G. Every Man , My Lord , is saved by his own
» Faith , not by the Faith of others. And God will
» reward every Man according to his *Works* , not the
» *Works* of others. Math. 16. §. 27. p. 187.

L. That's very certain. God will reward none for other Men's *Works* ; but he will reward every one according to his own *Works*. Pray remember that ; for those very Words decide the Question against you. Because if *Salvation* be the Reward of good *Works* , as it most certainly is , nay a Reward stipulated between God and Man by Virtue of his *Promise* , it follows , that when the *Works* to which Heaven is promised

promised as a *Reward*, are perform'd we *deserve* or *Merit* the *Reward*.

G. But then, My Lord, how miserable is the Condition of the Souls supposed to be in *Purgatory*, if they must not be deliver'd thence but by the *Works of Supererogation*, when no Man can be saved by his own *Works*! pag. 187. "

L. What Sr! Are not a Man's own *Works* conducing to *Salvation*? Did you not just now tell me, that *God* will reward every one according to his *Works*? Or are not the *Saints*, who are already in *Heaven*, rewarded according to their *Works*? And is not *Salvation* the *Reward* they have received? If then *Salvation* be a *Reward*, and this *Reward* is given them for their *Works*, we may in a true Sense say their *Works* have saved them. But if you only mean, that no Man can be saved by his own *Works* consider'd nakedly in themselves, and independently of the *Merits of Christ*, I know not any Christian that will oppose you.

But pray, Sr, who ever told you, that the Souls in *Purgatory* are not to be deliver'd thence but by the *Works of Supererogation* practis'd by the *Saints*? They pray indeed incessantly for their suffering Brethren. But their Prayers are all offer'd up through the *Mediation of Jesus-Christ*, whose *Treasure of infinite Merits* can never be exhausted; and is a Fund the Souls in *Purgatory* can securely rely upon for their Deliverance from their Pains. So that as long as this subsists, they can never be destitute of the Helps their Condition is capable of. I repeat what I said before, viz. that tho the *Saints* have received the full *Recompence* of all their *Merits*, this hinders not but that the greater their *Merits* are, the more acceptable to *God* are their Prayers on the one Hand, and the more available on the other

for the Relief of those, who stand in need of them.

» G. My Lord, the *Apostle* tells us, we are saved
 » not according to our Works, but according to the Grace
 » of God in Christ Jesus. 2. Tim. 1. v. 9. And again.
 » Not by the Works of Righteousness, which we have
 » done, but according to his Mercy he has saved us ----
 » through Jesus-Christ our Saviour. Tit. 3. v. 5. 6. p. 187.
 » 188.

L. Sr, you have mangled both the Texts, and omitted that Part which helps to explain them. St Paul's Words to Timothy are thus. *Who has deliver'd us, and call'd us with an holy Calling not according to our Works, but according to his holy Purpose and Grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the World began.* Where it is plain he speaks of the Grace of Predestination, which no Man can merit. His Words to Titus are as follow. *But after that the Kindness and Love of God our Saviour towards Man appear'd, not by the Works of Righteousness, which we had done, but according to his Mercy he saved us by the Washing of Regeneration, and Renewing of the holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus-Christ our Saviour.* Whence it appears, that St Paul speaks here of the first Grace of Justification by Baptism, which likewise no Man can Merit.

» G. My Lord, we have but one Saviour, nor
 » can we be saved by the Merits of any other. None
 » other can merit from God. The greatest Saint that
 » ever was is only saved by Mercy, and the Forgi-
 » veness of his Sins. Let us therefore not trust to
 » the Supererogated Works of those, who were not
 » able to save themselves. That every Mouth may be
 » stopped, and all the World may become guilty before
 » God. Rom. 3. v. 9. For in his Sight shall no Man li-
 » ving be justified, there is none righteous, no not one.
 » Plal. 114. v. 2. pag. 188.

L. Sr, all Men in the *World* are *Sinners*, which suffices to verify the Texts you have quoted. However it is certain there are many in the *World* free from *mortal Sin*, and these are in a State of *Meriting* though the *Grace* and *Merits* of *Jesus-Christ* notwithstanding their daily Failings.

You say, *we have but one Saviour, nor can we be saved by the Merits of any other.* Very right Sr, because our own good *Works* have no *Merit* or *Value*, but what they derive from the *Merits of Christ*, which must be applied to us to render our *Works* conducive to *Salvation*. But God has been pleased to establish Things upon this Footing, *viz.* that tho he has *redeem'd* us without us, he will not *save* us without our *Cooperation*; and Heaven must be the *Reward* of our *Perseverance* in good *Works*.

You add, *that none but Christ can Merit of God.* Sr, none but *Christ* can merit *independently* and of himself: but *dependently* of him and with the Assistance of his *holy Grace* all Men can *Merit*: and all that pretend to *Salvation*, must merit it by good *Works*: because God will reward every Man according to his *Works*.

Lastly you say, *the greatest Saint that ever was is saved only by Mercy and the Forgiveness of Sins.* Sr, the *Grace of Repentance*, by which we obtain the Forgiveness of our Sins is a pure *Mercy*, and all *Merit* is a *Gift of God*. Whence it follows, that tho they who are saved are rewarded according to their *Merits*, yet they are saved by *Mercy*. And this is entirely conformable to the Doctrine of the Council of Trent teaching, *that eternal Life ought to be proposed both as a Grace mercifully proposed to the Children of God, and as a Reward Faithfully to be render'd to their good Works and Merits.* Sess. 6. C. 16. In Effect, Sr, this whole Dispute is about a *meer Word*; on which you will

needs fasten a bad Sense in Spite of our Protesting continually against it , and explaining it in such an orthodox Meaning , as in your Hearts you cannot but allow of.

„ G. But , My Lord , besides all I have said , there
 „ are *Degrees of Glory* in Heaven. So that if any could
 „ *supererogate* , yet has he nothing to spare for others,
 „ because he has received the full of his *Reward*
 „ himself. pag. 188.

L. Sr, I am glad to hear you speak some Sense at last. For if there be *Degrees of Glory* in Heaven , and every Saint has received his *full Reward* , it follows that every Saint has received for Reward a Degree of Glory proportion'd to his *Works* or *Deserts* in this Life. And do's not that demonstrate the Doctrine of *Merits*?

„ G. But , My Lord , this shuts up *Purgatory* for
 „ ever by Exhausting every Penny of that *Treasury*
 „ reserved for their Redemption from thence. pag.
 „ 188.

L. I hope , Sr , that as long as the infinite Treasure of the *Merits* and *Satisfaction* of Christ is not exhausted , there will always be a sufficient Fund for the Redemption of Souls out of *Purgatory* : and so there will be no Danger of it's being *shut up*.

G. But I have another Argument against your Doctrine both of *venial Sins* and *Purgatory*. viz.
 „ That the Expectation of having those many Sins
 „ call'd *Venial* with you remitted after Death , do's
 „ naturally make Men more careless in their Life.
 „ And trusting to the Merits of others will abate
 „ their Diligence in being *nicely righteous* themselves.
 „ pag. 188.

L. Really , Sr , you make me smile. For if Believing a *Purgatory* hinders Men from Endeavouring to be *nicely Righteous* , then I am bound in good Man-

ners to suppose, that they, who believe no *Purgatory* (and you are one of those) study to be most *nicely righteous*. Well, Sr, I hope at least that trusting in the *Merits of Christ* will not abate our Diligence in being *nicely Righteous*.

You speak of *venial Sin*, as if you believed no such Thing. What mean then these Words of St James, *in many Things we all offend*? For I presume he do's not mean, that *himself* and the other *Apostles* were guilty of many *mortal Sins*.

But you think *their being remitted after Death makes Men more careless in this Life*. Yes, Sr, if they were remitted without Punishment we might grow careless of them. But, as you have already described *Purgatory* for us, viz. *that it is a Place of Fire, where souls are put under Pains equal to those of Hell except their Duration*, I think the Temptation to slight them is not like to be very great, till Men grow fonder of being burnt, than we yet find they are.

ADVERTISEMENT.

His Lordship having been silent for five whole Pages together in the former Conversation, opens his Mouth at last, and out comes this wise Saying. We find some Instances among the Fathers of Prayers for the Dead. To which the Gentleman answers in the following Manner.

G. Some few among the Fathers you may, but none in Scripture. pag. 188. "

§. 50.

Praying for the Relief of the Dead has been the constant Practice of the Catholick Church.

L. **B**Ut is there any Thing in Scripture against it? No, you cannot so much as strain a Text to make a Flourish with; tho you are as good at it as any Man living. And if there be no Scripture against it, it's not being mention'd in Scripture can no more prove it to be no Article of Faith, than it proves the *Validity of Infant-baptism* to be no Article of Faith; for there is not the least Instance or Mention of it in Scripture.

However we read in the Book of *Machabees*, that *Judas Machabeus* sent to *Jerusalem* to have Sacrifice offer'd for his dead Soldiers. I know your Church do's not allow that Book to be *Canonical*. But St *Cyprian* call'd them *Divine Scripture*. Epist. 55. ad *Corn. Papam*. So did St *Ambrose* L. 2. de *Jacob*. &c. C. 10. 11. and St *Isidore* of *Seville*, who writes thus. *The Jews reject the Books of Machabees, yet the Church honours them as divine Books*. L. 6. *Originum*. St *Austin* was of the same Opinion. *The Church*, says he, *reckons them among the canonical Books, tho the Jews do not*. L. 18. de *Civit. Dei*. C. 36. But his Words L. de *cura pro mortuis* C. 1. are remarkable. *We read*, says he, *in the Book of Machabees, that Sacrifice was offer'd for the Dead*. But tho this were not to be found in the ancient Scriptures, the Authority of the universal Church, which is eminent for this Practice, is of no small Weight. Here, Sr, you see St *Austin* insists upon the publick Practice of the universal Church in Offering up Prayers for the Dead. So that you must have a good Assurance to tell me, that some few Fathers speak of it, as if the Thing were doubtful,

G. But, My Lord, what were these Prayers? " They were for *Peace* and *Rest* to those, who were " supposed to be in *Peace*, yet might receive an " *Increase* of *Happiness* even before the *Resurrec-* " *tion*; as some suppose heaven itself to consist in " an *eternal increase* of *Bliss*. But without this we " may pray for the *Continuation* of *Peace* to those " who are in *Peace*, tho we know it will surely be, " as when we pray, *thy Kingdom come, thy will be done*: " we know it must be, but this shews our *Assent* and " *Wishes* for it. And in this *Sense* we also pray " for the *Dead*, that it would please God *shortly* to " accomplish the *Number* of the *Elect*, and to hasten his " *Kingdom*, that we wish all those who are departed in " the true *Faith* of his holy *Name* may have the perfect " *Consummation* and *Bliss* both in *Body* and *Soul* in his " *eternal* and *everlasting* *Glory*. And we bless him for " all his *Servants* departed this *Life* in his *Faith* and " *Fear*, beseeching him to give us *Grace* so to follow their " good *Example*, that with them we may be *Partakers* " of his heavenly *Kingdom*. So that we pray for them " as well as ourselves, that we may with them be " *Partakers*, &c. But neither these Prayers of ours, " nor those of the *Ancients* have any *Relation* to " *Purgatory*, or *Delivering* *Souls* from thence as a " *Place* of *Torments*. pag. 189. "

L. Sr, I cannot but say, the Prayer you have recited is cunningly enough contrived; for it may serve either for the *Living* or the *Dead*. However there is one Thing very singular in it; viz. that (for Example) a *Son*, who go's to his *Father's* *Burial* thanks God for having taken him out of this *Life*. Which I think is not very *instructive* or *Edifying*. But let that be as it will, since you own, that you pray for the *Dead* as well as we, I doubt you will find it a hard Task to piece up this Rag of

Popery by Saying that your Prayers have no Relation to Purgatory. For according to my dull Notion, to pray for others is to beg something they either want, or may lose; and to pray that those, who are secure of eternal Rest, may continue to have it, is as great a *Solecism* as to pray that a Man may continue to be a Man, and a Woman a Woman: or that the Saints in Heaven may never be damn'd.

As to the two Petitions, you quote from the *Lord's Prayer*, by the first we ask to become *Partakers of God's Kingdom*, and by the second that we may always *accomplish his holy will*, which I think are of the Number of things, we are not sure of.

But if the Subject of our Prayers for the *Souls departed* be, that they who are in Heaven may receive a *continual Encrease of Bliss*, then I presume the *blest Virgin Mary* is principally remember'd in your good *Protestant Prayers*. For no Saint in Heaven deserves a *continual Encrease of Bliss* more than she. And I hope the *Apostles* and *Martyrs* will not be forgot. Tho St *Austin* was of Opinion that to pray for a *Martyr* was to put an Affront upon him. And indeed I cannot but think that Recommending ourselves to the Prayers of the *Saints* is far more congruous to good Sense than Praying for them.

However you have my free Consent to order your own Prayers as incongruously as you please. But I cannot brook your Drawing the *ancient Fathers* into the same Absurdity by Asserting that their Prayers for the *Souls departed* were only offer'd up for *Peace and Rest* to those, who were supposed to be in *Peace*. This is a bold Contradiction to plain Fact, and obliges me to prove you guilty either of *Ignorance* or *Insincerity* in Advancing so notorious a Falsehood. A few chosen Passages of the *Fathers* will fully make good this Charge against you.

Tertullian

Tertullian says of a faithful Widow : she both prays for the Soul of her Husband, and begs a REFRESHMENT for him in the mean Time ---- and keeps his Anniversaries. For unless she do's these Things, she has repudiated her Husband as far as in her lies. *L. de Monogam. C. 10.*

One of *Aerius's* Heresies in the 4th Century according to *St Epiphanius* was that the Prayers and Alms of the Living did the Dead no good. *Hær. 75. §. 3. T. 1. pag. 908.* Against whom he writes, that the Church has this Tradition from Christ, that Prayers are profitable, tho they do not extinguish ALL SINS. §. 8. pag. 912. and that we mention the Saints and others in a quite different Manner. The Saints, that we may give Christ a singular Honour, and others that we may obtain MERCY for them.

St Chrysostom writes thus. The Apostles (says he) did not in vain command these Things, that in the venerable and dreadful Mysteries (that is, the holy Sacrifice of the Mass) the Dead should be remember'd. For they knew they would derive a considerable Advantage from it. *Hom. 3. in Epist. ad Phil.*

And again : *Hom. 41. in Epist. 1. ad Cor.* he writes thus. The Dead may be help'd by Prayers and Alms and Offerings ; because they were not instituted in vain. And concludes, let us therefore help them. For we have before us the expiatory Sacrifice of the World ---- it may happen that we may obtain A TOTAL PARDON for them by Prayers, by Oblations, by the Saints, who are named with them.

St Cyril of Jerusalem writes thus. Lastly we pray for all that die amongst us : thinking it to be the greatest Help that can be to their Souls to have the holy and dreadful Sacrifice of the Altar offer'd in Supplication for them. *Cat. Mystag. 5. pag. 241.*

We also find *St Austin* writing in the same Manner. By the Prayers of the holy Church (says he) and
II. Part, S f

the wholesome Sacrifice and Alms it is not to be doubted but the Dead are assisted ; so that God deals MORE MERCIFULLY with them than their Sins have deserved. Which he proves thus. Because it is the Practice of the whole Church to offer Sacrifice for them. But he adds. These are not beneficial to all the Dead , but only to those, that lived so before their Death , that they might be a Help to them after it. And therefore we do not say the Dead have any new Merits , but that they reap this Fruit from their good Actions before. Serm. 172. (olim 32. de verbis Apost.) §. 2.

Here , Sr , we have Fathers of the third , fourth , and fifth Century positively Maintaining a State of Souls in the other World , wherein they are refresh'd , help'd , favour'd with the Pardon of some Sins , receiving considerable Advantage , and more mercifully dealt with than their Sins deserved in Consideration of the Prayers , Alms , and holy Sacrifice of the Altar offer'd up for them by the Faithful upon Earth : and this is represented by them as a Practice commanded by the Apostles themselves. So that I leave any one to Judge , whether any Credit is to be given to what you say , even when you assert Things with the most positive Assurance ; as that there are some few Instances among the Fathers of Prayers for the Dead ; and that they were only offer'd up for Peace and Rest to those , who were supposed to be in Peace. Unhappy ignorant People , who are imposed upon and misled by such faithless and deceitful Guides !

„ G. My Lord , some of the Ancients had an
 „ Imagination of purging Fire , through which Sin-
 „ ners were to pass. But they meant the general Con-
 „ flagration at the last Day , which comes not at all
 „ to your notion of Purgatory. pag. 189. 190.

L. Nor is it any Thing to the Purpose. But did the Fathers , I have quoted , when they exhorted the

People to offer up *Prayers, Alms, and the holy Sacrifice of the Altar* for the Relief of their Friends already deceased, did they, I say, speak of the *general Conflagration*? Nay do's it not demonstrate, that they believed there was *then a State*, in which the Souls departed were capable of Receiving *Heip, Refreshment, the Pardon of some Sins*, and (as *St Chrysostom* expresses it) a *considerable Advantage* from them.

§. 51.

Some Remarks upon the Gentleman's Performance.

G. MY Lord, I will not trouble you with many Excursions, or Debating every Branch of these Disputes. I have only given you a *summary View of the Heart of the Cause* to let you see where the matter *pinches*. And indeed my Endeavour with your Lordship is rather to *state the Case*, than to *argue upon it*. For *Truth* needs no more than to be fairly shew'd, it convinces of itself, and best when it is *naked* without the *Fucus* of *Philosophy* and *Distinctions*, which are endless. These will put a Colour upon *implicit Faith* itself, and make you believe you understand what you know nothing of. My Lord, give me leave to say, your whole Religion is *implicit*, not only as to the particular Points we have discoursed; but your whole publick Worship is such, while your Prayers are in a Language not understood by the People. How then can they pray with the *Understanding*, as the *Apostle* requires? 1. Cor. 14. v. 15. 16. And how can they say *Amen*? Seeing they understand not what is said. pag. 190.

L. I perceive, Sr, we are at Length got out of *Purgatory*, and this fine Speech is only meant as a

Prologue to something else. However I shall beg leave to make a few Remarks upon it, because it contains some sly Insinuations, which may easily be misunderstood. You tell me, *you have only given me a Summary of the Heart of the Cause to let me see where the Matter pinches: and you have rather stated the Case than argued upon it.* Very true Sr. For tho you have said much, you have argued but little, and proved much less. Which is perhaps the Reason, why I do not see *where the Matter Pinches.* However I presume this is to let me understand how favourably I have been used, and what a World of fine Things more you could have said upon the several Subjects we have handled. I assure you Sr, I will not be ungrateful, but freely own the Favour you have done me. For I question not, but you might have said a thousand Things more, full as *pertinent and true* as those you have said.

As for Instance, instead of half a Dozen Texts of *Scripture* at a Time, you might as easily have produced a Dozen more, full as much to the Purpose: and instead of Playing Tricks of Legerdemain with some *Fathers* only, you might have cut out for me much more Work by quoting all the rest with the same Sincerity. And your not having given me this Trouble it doubtless a Favour I am bound to acknowledge.

You say, *truth needs no more than to be fairly shewn: it convinces of itself and best when it is naked.* This Maxim is very good if meant of *natural Truths* or the *first Principles of Reason*, which convince of themselves and are best seen by their own Light. But I do not see how *reveal'd Truths* can come within the Application of this Rule. For I never heard of a Man convinced of the *Mysteries* of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation* by the Evidence of these Truths; or by

any *Reasons* that could serve as a Light to see them by. These therefore, and indeed all other *Mysteries*, that are above the Reach of our Understanding, can be believed no otherwise than by *Captivating ourselves unto the Obedience of Faith*.

But waving this Argument if *Truth needs but to be fairly shew'd to convince*, and *convinces best when it is naked*, I must conclude that *naked Truth* is either no *Protestant Ware*, or you take no Delight to deal in it. For I assure you faithfully, there is but one Thing you have convinced me of since we conversed together, to wit, that you are no *Papist*: For you have not establish'd the positive Principles of any one particular Religion in the *World*; nor have you offer'd an Argument of any Note but what would have the same Force in the Mouth of an *Anabaptist* or *Quaker* as it has in Yours. So that supposing I were now disposed to abjure *Popery*, you have not furnish'd me with one single Motive to become a Member of the *Church of England* rather than any other *Protestant* Communion. And is it not then pleasant to hear you talk of nothing but *naked Truths*, of *the Heart of the Cause*, of *Shewing where the matter Pinches*, and such other *gasconading Stuff*? As if every Thing you have said carried *Conviction, Evidence*, and *Demonstration* with it. Whereas I have scarce had any other Business upon my Hands than to rectify Mistakes or wilful Misrepresentations of our Doctrine: to be upon my Guard against the most studied and imposing *Sophistry*, to confute bold *Calumnies* and *Falshoods*, and deliver both *Fathers* and *Scriptures* from the Torture. This, Sir, is a faithful Summary of the *naked Truths* I have had to deal with; This is your Method of *Shewing the Heart of the Cause* and where the matter *Pinches*.

I need not say any Thing to the passing Flirt.

you had Just now at *implicit Faith*; of which I have said enough in our Dispute concerning *Transubstantiation* [2. p. §. 31.] where I shew'd our Faith to be no more *implicit* than St *Peter's* was, when he said to Christ, *thou hast the Words of eternal Life and we believe*, &c. Joh. 6. v. 68. or than your Faith is when you believe the whole Bible, a considerable Part whereof you neither know nor understand.

§. 52.

Of the Liturgy in Latin.

L Et us therefore now come to the trivial Question about our *Liturgy*, the Mention whereof has made you just now say, that *our whole Religion is implicit*. But I see no great Occasion for *implicit Faith* to approve of the Church's Discipline in Saying *Maß in Latin*.

1. There is no Need of *implicit Faith* to believe, that the common People (of *England*, for Example) understand *English*, into which the *Maß* is translated as it is into other Languages.

2. There is no Need of *implicit Faith* to believe the common People have Eyes and can see. Now the *Maß* being a *Sacrifice* is more an *Action* than Prayer; And Actions are known by *seeing* as Words are by *Hearing*. In Effect, the People know that our Saviour's sacred *Body* and *Blood* are offer'd up in the *Maß*; and if they can but bring their Hearts fill'd with *Faith*, *Hope*, *Love*, *Repentance*, *Thanksgiving*, and other such Acts of Devotion, they cannot fail of receiving the Benefit of this holy Sacrifice.

It was God's Command Lev. 16. v. 17. that the People should not be in the Tabernacle, when the

Priest went in to make an *Attonement* for all the Congregation of Israel. And in the Gospel we find the whole Multitude of the People praying without in the Time of the Incense. Luke 1. v. 10. Yet this was a publick Prayer and Liturgy of God's own Appointment. Whence I conclude, that there is no Need of implicit Faith to believe, that the People may join in Prayer with the Priest, tho their Prayer be not the same as his.

3. There is no Need of *implicit Faith* to believe, that the *Catholick Church* profess'd in the *Creed* was by God's Help and the Experience of about 900 Years wise enough to know what Language *Maß* was to be said in.

4. There is no Need of *implicit Faith* to believe, that nothing could be more absurd in the *first Reformers*, than to make that a Pretence of Breaking Communion with their *Mother-Church*. And

5. There is no Need of *implicit Faith* to believe, that the Desire of the Heart is the principal Prayer: whence it follows that he, who in his Heart begs of God whatever is contain'd in the Prayer he recites, tho he do's not understand it, prays as truly as another that understands it.

These, Sr, are the Preliminaries I insist upon in this weighty Dispute, and of which I will not bate you an Ace: because they are *naked Truths without the Fucus of Philosophy or Distinctions*, and convince of themselves. Now then you may put what Objections you please.

G. My Lord, the People's saying their own private Prayers is not *joining* with the Priest. p. 190. "

L. No Sr? Then the People's *Praying without in the Time of the Incense* Luke 1. v. 10. was much less joining with the Priest. For they could not even see him in the *Tabernacle*: whereas ours see him at

the *Altar Offering the Sacrifice*. What then should hinder them from Offering it up jointly with him?

» G. They cannot say *Amen* to his Prayers. What then have they to do in the Church? For this is not *Communion*. pag. 191.

L. Is it not So? I think joining Prayers together is *Communion*: and that is precisely the Business they have to do in the Church. But I cannot forbear Similing at your excessive Scrupulosity. You say the People cannot say *Amen* to the Prayers of the Priest. Pray, what should hinder them? Do they fear he is *Cursing* them, or *Conjuring* up some *evil Spirit*? Do they not know he is *Praying* for them? And why then should they scruple to say *Amen* to his Prayers?

» G. All he do's is purely *implicit*, and nothing else but *opus operatum*. pag. 191.

L. Really, Sr, this *implicit*, and *opus operatum* run away so entirely with your Reason and Judgment, that they make you forget to speak common Sense.

» G. My Lord, A *Liturgy* in a Tongue unknown to the People is an *Invention* without Precedent. For it never enter'd into the Head of *Man* or Church since the Creation, except only in the Church of *Rome*: and of which the *Apostle* gives this Character, will they not say ye are mad? 1. Cor. 14. v. 16. 17. pag. 191.

L. Sr, turn the Question homewards, and I will not scruple to resolve it in the *Affirmative*. For nothing but one Labouring under a more than ordinary *Delirium* can be capable of Asserting as you do, that a *Liturgy* in a Tongue not known to the People is an *Invention* without Precedent, and never enter'd into the Head of *Man* or Church since the Creation, except only the Church of *Rome*. This I presume Sr, is one of your *masked Truths*, which convince of themselves.

But

But the learned Dr Walton in the *Prologomena* upon his *Polyglot* will inform you better, and let you know, first, that whole Churches in the East have this Custom. So that (says he) the common People do not understand the Liturgies of Basil and Chrysostom, which are read publickly in the Churches. C. 5. §. 1. 16. and 2dly, that not only Christians, but Jews and Mahometans have the same Custom in the East. *Officia divina linguis non vulgaribus hodie celebrantur apud Judaeos, Christianos, & Mahumedanos.* C. 5. §. 3. see also Cap. 13. §. 18.

Mr Brerewood another Protestant Author in his *Enquiries* Chap. 2. pag. 12. agrees exactly with Dr Walton. For speaking of the Greek Church, the Difference (says he) is become so great between the present and the ancient Greek, that their Liturgy yet read in the ancient Greek Tongue, namely, that of Basil on the Sabbaths and solemn Days, and that of Chrysostom on common Days is not understood, or but little of it by the Vulgar People.

Monf. Tavernier tells us of the Nestorians, p. 69. that they perform the Divine Office in the Chaldaick: to which the learned Author of the *Guide in Controversies* adds, pag. 289. that Divine Service is celebrated in the corrupt Chaldaick or Syriack amongst the Maronites, Cophites, Nestorians, Assyrians or Jacobites: and in the Greek amongst the Melchites and Georgians: the Vulgar to all these being the Arabick; or to some more Easterly the Persian Tongue.

But to come nearer Home, Dr Heylin tells us in his *History of the Reformation* p. 128. That in Queen Elizabeth's Time the Irish Parliament pass'd an Act for Uniformity in Common Prayer with Permission of Saying the same in Latin, where the Minister had not the knowledge of the English Tongue. But for Translating it into Irish there was no Care taken. The People were required

by that Statute under several Penalties to frequent their Churches, and to be present at the Reading of the English Liturgy, which they understood no more than they do the *Maß*.

Now, Sr, if you had lived in Queen Elizabeth's Days, I doubt whether your zeal would have carried you so far, as to have address'd her thus in St Paul's Words; will they not say you are Mad for Passing such an Act, and furnishing the Papists with Stones to throw back at us?

But since you assert, it never enter'd into the Head of Man, &c. Martin Luther, Sr, as great a Man as he was (for he was certainly a *Man*) did not think it absurd to have the Liturgy in *Latin*. For in the first Part of his Book writ against *Carlostadius* and the *Fanaticks* Ann. 1525. (*apud Hospin.*) he grants first, that the Name of *Maß* may still be kept; and 2dly, that it is an indifferent Thing, whether it be said in a foreign or the *Vulgar* Tongue. And pray Sr, what will all Men of knowledge and Sincerity now think of your noble Assertion, that a Liturgy in a Tongue unknown to the People is an Invention without Precedent! and that it never enter'd into the Head of Man or Church since the Creation, except only in the Church of Rome! Sr, to return your own Compliment in St Paul's Words, will they not say you are Mad?

I add, that in the primitive Ages the Liturgy was perform'd in the same Language it is now both in the *Eastern* and *Western* Churches; and if our Liturgy be not as commonly understood now as it was formerly, 'tis not because the Church has made any Alteration in it's former Language, or desires that her publick Service should not be understood by the common People; but because all *Vulgar Tongues* are subject to perpetual Changes; as is manifest from

the Difference there is between our *modern English*, and what was spoken in the Days of *Chaucer*. So that if every Nation had laid aside the *Latin*, and perform'd the *Liturgy* in it's own Language, the publick Service of every National Church must have undergone as many Changes as there have been in those Languages. Besides that such *Priests* and *Bishops*, as are obliged to travel abroad, would have been render'd utterly incapable by it of Performing their Functions in foreign Countries; which is a very considerable Inconvenience, and was doubtless a Consideration of Weight to induce the *Western* Church to adhere to the *ancient Latin*, and the *Greek* Church to their *ancient Greek* in their publick Service, rather than suffer any Innovation to be made in it.

But I cannot Imagine, what Reason you should have to quote the 14th Chapter of *St Paul* to the *Corinthians* unless it be because it is nothing to the Purpose. For our Dispute is about the *Liturgy*, that is, the *publick Office* establish'd by the Church; and *St Paul* speaks not a Word in the whole Chapter of any Thing like a *Liturgy*, or *publick Office*, or *set Form* of Prayers, but only of sudden extemporary Exhortations and Prayers, which even Laypersons by a miraculous Gift of unknown Tongues utter'd to the People in publick Assemblies, but many Times without any *Interpretation* of what they said. And this *St Paul* disapproves of, and censures in that Chapter particularly *ψ. 11. 16. 17.*

G. But, My Lord, his Arguments are of equal Force against your Practice. For his Reasons against it are *first*, because the unlearned cannot say *Amen* to Prayers they do not understand. *ψ. 16.* and *2dly*, because they cannot be *edified* by Exhortations and Prayers in a foreign Tongue. *ψ. 17.*

L. Very right, Sr, if there be not an *Interpreter* to explain them: which is the very Supposition, upon which the *Apostle's* Arguments are grounded. But is that our Case? You must shut both your Eyes to see no Difference. For, *first*, the common People can see as well as Schollars; and when they are once taught what every Part of the *Maß* means, they can never want *Interpreters* as long as they can see. But *2dly*, the Translation of the *Maß*, as likewise of *Vespers*, *Litanies*, *Hymns* and *Prayers* into the vulgar Languages of every Country is I think a very good *Interpretation* of them, and takes away all the weighty Scruples of Saying *Amen*. I add, that in Relation to the *publick Office*, or any *set Form* of Prayers ordain'd by the Church, no Man surely in his right Senses can hesitate to say *Amen* to it, tho he understands not a Word of it, for the Reasons already given.

Now since St Paul speaks not of any *publick Office*, or *set Form* of Prayers ordain'd by the Church, but only of extemporary Prayers or Exhortations pronounced by private Persons in a *Tongue unknown*, and without any *Interpreter* to explain them, nothing can be wider from the Purpose, than to object his Words against our *Liturgy* in *Latin*. But a weak Cause can have nothing but weak Arguments to support it.

» G. I must own, My Lord, your Doctrine suits
 » well with what *Suarez* says (de Orat. L. 3. C. 14.)
 » that it is not necessary to Prayor, that the Person
 » Praying should think of what he speaks. This is *opus*
 » *operatum* with a Witness; and a Parrot may be
 » taught thus to pray. And how do they pray with
 » the Priest, who are Talking of Business, or Chat-
 » ting of News, whilst he is Offering up their
 » Prayers to God in a Language, of which they do

not understand one Word, and therefore cannot give Attention to it? And these are the greatest Number, viz. of the common People, who cannot read, and so cannot carry private Books of Devotion with them. Tho if they did, it would not be joining with the Priest, nor could these be call'd *common Prayer*, which are offer'd up with one Accord, pursuant to Saint Chrysostom's Prayer, with which our daily publick Prayers do conclude. pag. 191. "

L. Sr, tho a Man were both *Deaf* and *Blind*, and could say nothing but the *Lord's Prayer*, yet the constant Repeating of that Prayer in Union with the Prayers of the Congregation is truly Praying with one Accord in the Judgment of any Man, that has not abjured common Sense; For 'tis the Prayer of the Heart, that God regards, and the Heart of such a one is as much United in Devotion with the whole Assembly, as if he repeated the same Prayers literally with them. This, Sr, answers your curious Observation concerning those in our Communion who cannot read: whom by an *Hyperbole* of a more than ordinary Size you have render'd at least fifty to one more numerous than they really are.

As to what you have quoted from *Suarez*, I may reasonably presume his meaning is either; that involuntary Dissipations of the Mind (during which no Man thinks of what he speaks) do not hinder the Effect or Fruit of Prayer; and this is the Doctrine of all spiritual Writers; or that the Mind may be raised to God, and by Consequence perform the essential Duty of Prayer, without an actual Attention to the Words that are pronounced. And do's this deserve to be ridiculed with your senseless common Topic of *opus Operatum*? Is this Praying like a Parrot, or like those, who are Talking of Business, or Chatting

of *News*, who only deserve to be driven out of the Church? However I suppose you intended this for a charitable Insinuation to all good *Protestants*, that this is the common *Way* of Praying amongst *Papists*: for which I return you my most hearty Thanks; and so take my Leave of you, since we have now gone through all the Points disputed between the two Churches.

G. I hope, My Lord, we shall one Day meet together in the *Unity of Faith*.

L. I heartily wish the same. But then it must be in the *Faith* of that *One, Holy, Catholick, and Apostolick Church*; which St Paul calls *the Pillar and Ground of Truth*. 1. Tim. 3. v. 15. to which Christ has promised his *perpetual Assistance*. Math. 28. v. 20. and against which *the Gates of Hell will never prevail*. Math. 16. v. 16. For this is the Church establish'd by Christ to be our *Guide to Heaven*; and he, who will not follow this Guide, runs into everlasting *Perdition*, and will have his Portion with *Heathens and Publicans*. Math. 18. v. 17.

F I N I S.

THE POSTSCRIPT.

CONTAINING SOME REMARKS
upon the *Gentleman's* Conclusion in the
former Conversation.

HAVING follow'd the *Gentleman* Step by Step for a hundred and ninety one Pages, I did not think my self bound to continue the Conversation any longer. For the Dispute in the *Gentleman's Case* stated ends page 191. and the twenty last Pages contain little more than a Recapitulation of what he has said against the *Pope's Supremacy*, the *Church's Unity*, and in Defence of *private Judgment* against the Authority of the *Church*. To speak properly, the main Subject of those twenty Pages is a triumphant Recital of the great Feats the *Gentleman* has done. He appears big with the Success of his Performance, and gives himself the Airs of a Conqueror returning loaden with the Spoils of a Vanquish'd Foe : whilst his *Lordship* is remarkable for nothing but his *stupid Silence*, and might, for ought I know, have been condemn'd to be press'd to Death for a *Mute*, were it not for about half a Dozen Lines of Nonsense utter'd by him in the whole twenty Pages. I may indeed justly compare him to a Criminal conscious of his Guilt, standing at the Bar with Eyes cast down to the Ground, whilst the Judge is Summing up the Evidence against him, and giving Directions to the jury to bring in their

Verdict. Nay we have nothing less than the *Gentleman's* own Word to assure us (and the Word of a *Gentleman* will surely not be question'd) that he has all the *Fathers* on his Side against the *Pope's* *Supremacy*, and all the Reason in the World on his Side against submitting to the *Authority* of the *Church*. He reminds his *Lordship* of his having proved *this* and *that*, and the Lord knows what. He has put such a Thing out of all Dispute; and made other Things plain to a Demonstration. And what then had his *Lordship* else to do but to submit to his hard Fate with a respectful Silence! I shall however venture to make some Remarks upon this Piece, which the *Gentleman* introduces in the following Manner. And now, My Lord, upon the whole, if the Advantage do's not seem to your *Lordship* to lye on our Side in all the particulars before mention'd, yet can you have any Doubt of the Safety of your Soul in our Way? Since all our Danger is in Omitting some Things that might be profitable, but cannot be call'd necessary. Whereas if the Error lies of your Side, you are involved in manifold Superstitions, and of Adding to, and subtracting from the Word of God. p. 191. 192.

Here the *Gentleman* either speaks of Particulars relating to Faith, or Discipline only (for he is a great Dealer in double Meanings) if he speaks of the former, his Question how his *Lordship* can have any Doubt of the Safety of his Soul in the Protestant Way, answers itself. Because his *Lordship* has already inform'd him, that the Belief of all Articles of Faith is necessary to Salvation, when they are duly proposed by the *Church*. And he is sure that many of the Articles denied by the *Gentleman* are of this Nature.

But if he speaks of Matters of Discipline only, tho they be not in themselves necessary to Salvation,
yet

yet Obedience to the Commands of the Church even in Things that are of themselves indifferent is necessary to Salvation, as his *Lordship* has fully shew'd in his Answer to the *Gentleman's* preliminary Questions in the *Introduction*.

Let us suppose a *Puritan* should argue thus against the *Gentleman* in his own Language. *Baptizing with the Sign of the Cross, Using the Common Prayer-book, and keeping holy Days for Saints and Angels, &c. may be profitable, but cannot be call'd necessary: whereas if the Error lies on your Side, you are involved in manifold Superstitions, by Adding to the Word of God. Suppose, I say, a Puritan should argue thus against the Gentleman, he would either be put to a Non-plus, or forced to give him this Popish Answer; that the Church is wise enough to regulate her own Discipline. That her Children are bound in Conscience to conform to it. That Schism is a most greivous Sin, and to break Communion under Pretence of Understanding Scriptures better than the Church is but Adding Presumption to Disobedience. This I think would be a solid Answer to the Puritan, and the Gentleman is desired to accept of this Answer as abundantly sufficient for all Objections he can make against Communion in one kind, the Liturgy in Latin, the single Life of the Clergy, the Use of Images in our Churches, of the Sign of the Cross, of holy Water, Benedictions, &c. All these being purely Matters of Discipline.*

But suppose an *Arian* should take the Advantage of the *Gentleman's* Argument, and retort it thus upon him. *All our Danger is in Omitting Consubstantiality, the Belief whereof is not necessary. Whereas if the Error lies on your Side, you are involved in manifest Blasphemy and Idolatry.* I leave the *Gentleman* to consider, what Answer he would give; and whether his Answer would not be a Cap to fit his own Block.

Of Supremacy.

THe two next Pages after the *Gentleman's* last Words quoted by me contain nothing but a Repetition of Objections against the *Pope's Supremacy* already answer'd in our Dispute upon that Subject: after which he continues thus. *No Kingdom of the Earth will content him. He will be universal Monarch of the whole World. And why so?* pag. 194.

In good Truth I cannot tell. For I cannot give a good Reason for a *Chimera*. And I dare swear the Pope himself knows nothing of the matter. But the Gentleman knows better Things, and answers the Question thus for the Pope. *Because Christ is the Head of all Churches, and therefore must have an universal Vicar.* This the Gentleman will needs have to be the Reason, why the Pope, as he tells us, pretends to be *universal Monarch of the whole World*. And I cannot but say, the Reason is as nonsensical as the *Chimera*, that is built upon it. But as the same *Art Magick*, which conjures up *Spirits*, can conjure them down again; so the Gentleman shews he can as easily confute *Chimeras*, as invent them: which he has done with great Skill by Saying, *that from the same Parity of Reason it would follow, that because God is the King of all the Earth, therefore he must have an universal Vicar in Temporals.* I allow the Parity to be good, and the aforesaid wise Reason fully confuted by it.

But I shall give him another Reason for the Pope's *Supremacy* (by whatever ridiculous name he is pleased to call it) which I hope will not be so easily confuted. It is grounded upon three plain Facts. 1. That Christ gave to St Peter by a *special Commission* the Government of his whole Flock. 2. That this

Power of Governing his whole Flock was not to die with *St Peter*, but like *Episcopacy* and *Priesthood* continue in his Church for ever by Passing to his Successors. And 3. That the Successors of *St Peter* have always been Bishops of *Rome*, whom we call *Popes* in our Language. The two first are of *Divine Institution*, and all three are as incontestable, as that the *See of Canterbury* is the Ecclesiastical *Metropolis* of *England*. At least I flatter myself they will appear so to any unbiass'd Reader, who will but give himself the Trouble to peruse, what his *Lordship* has said in Defence of the *Supremacy*, 1. p. §. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. and 55. of the same Part.

Nor can I see how the *Gentleman* and his *Protestant* Brethren will escape being convicted of *Heresy* and *Schism* by his own Confession, since he tells us pag. 194. 195. That they will own themselves *Hereticks* and *Schismatics*, and pay their Obedience to the *Pope*, if it can be shew'd that *Christ* has appointed an universal *Vicar* in his Church; unless by universal *Vicar* he means a great Deal more than we do, and then he fights against his own Shadow. For we mean no more than that *St Peter* was, and his *Successor* is next under *Christ* the *supreme Head* or *Governour* of his Church in *Spirituals*. And he who cannot find this in the Text of *St Mathew* 16. & 18. And *St John* 21. & 15. where all Antiquity clearly found it, is wilfully blind.

I therefore cannot doubt but the Reader will be extremely surprized at the *Gentleman's* exorbitant *Rhodomontado* pag. 195. where he speaks thus. *We are verily perswaded, that there is not the least Ground for this universal Supremacy either in holy Scriptures, or in Antiquity, or in the Reason of the Thing, or in Fact since the first Foundation of Christianity to this Day, or that it ever was acknowledg'd, or is now by the Majority of*

Christian Churches. Was there ever such a Complication of Falsehoods utter'd with such a confident Air ! What ! Not the *least* Ground for the Supremacy either in *Scriptures*, or *Antiquity*, or *Reason*, or *Fact* from the first Foundation of Christianity to this Day ! And is the *Gentleman* verily persuaded of this ! Then he must be verily persuaded, that the whole Island of *Great Britain* (for it's Share alone) was Mad for nine hundred Years together : since it acknowledg'd (as he owns himself *Case stated* p. 108.) the Pope's *spiritual Supremacy* for so many Ages : which none but a People void of Sense would have done upon a Principle of Conscience, if there were not the *least* Ground for it either in *Scriptures*, or *Antiquity*, or *Reason*, or *Fact* from the first Foundation of Christianity, as the *Gentleman* has the Assurance to tell us. But when he wrote this he was sole master of the Field. His *Lordship* was under *Tutelage*, and could not contradict his *Tutor* without his Allowance, who took effectual Care to tie up his Tongue, and doubted not but any *Tale of a Tub* would pass for current Truth with the Bubbles he chiefly wrote for. And this he calls *Stating the Case*. But I hope the *Case of Supremacy* is somewhat more fairly stated by his *Lordship* in the several *Sections*, to which I have just now refer'd the Reader. And as to what the *Gentleman* says, that the *Supremacy* never was acknowledg'd by the *Majority of Christian Churches*, the Reader is desired to turn back to §. 16. 17. of the *first Part*, where he will be fully convinced of the notorious Falsehood of this Assertion.

Page 195. 196. the *Gentleman* entertains us with a fine Flourish upon the Inconvenience of *Appeals to Rome*, where he says *Causes last from Age to Age*. This (says he) made the *Reformation* even necessary for the *Preservation of the People as well Laity as Clergy*, who

groan'd under the Burden, which neither they nor their Fathers were able to bear. However I must take the Liberty to tell the Gentleman, that England was as flourishing a Kingdom, and the People both *Laity* and *Clergy* lived as comfortably under the Pope's *spiritual Supremacy*, as they have done since it was thrown off. But let that be as it will, are there no Ways and Means to put a Stop to Abuses without Affronting, or pulling down the Authority, that commits them? Are there not Lawfuits in *Great Britain* entail'd upon Families from Generation to Generation? And must we then conclude, that the *Court of Chancery* and other *Courts of Judicature* ought to be suppress'd, because frequent Abuses are committed in them? Nay I fear the *Supreme Tribunal* itself which is the *Bulwark* of the *English Liberties*, will not be secure against the destructive Force of this *Logick*.

But the *Gentleman's* Argument strikes yet much deeper: for the Question between us is precisely, whether the Pope's *Supremacy* be of *Divine Institution*? We maintain it is; and 'tis his Business to disprove it. Now I appeal to any Man, whether *real* or *supposed Abuses* of any *Authority* be an Argument of any Force to prove it not to be of *Divine Institution*? If not, all Arguing against it from such Abuses is wholly frivolous. But if it be a solid Argument, and if it be true that such Abuses (as the *Gentleman* tell us) *make a Reformation* which annuls that Institution necessary, then the *blessed Sacrament*, which is abused by Thousands to their own Damnation, is the first Thing that ought to be reform'd away, and discarded as well as the *Pope's Supremacy*.

But besides all this, what a frightful List of enormous Abuses committed by *secular Magistrates* and *Parents* in Relation to their *Subjects* and *Children*

might a Man produce , if it were worth his Pains ? And would this be a good Argument to prove that their Power and Authority is not of God , or that a *Reformation* is necessary to abolish all Power upon Earth ? Thus the *Gentleman's* Arguing from real or supposed Abuses of the *Pope's Supremacy* to justify an absolute Denial or Abolishing of it , would make one suspect him to be neither *Divine* , nor a *good Christian* , nor *good Subject*. For it plainly tends to subvert the Institutions of God , and cuts down all *Power Root and Branch* : since all these are liable to be abused.

I come now to a Piece of Slander , which for it's Boldness is hard to be match'd. It is worded thus , pag. 197. 198. *The Pope's Supremacy* (upon which the Discourse runs) *is the only Article in your Creed* (speaking to his Lordship) *to be believed explicitly. As for others , implicit will do for them all. That is , it is no Matter , whether you believe them or not : so the Sovereignty of the universal Bishop be maintain'd inviolably.* I cannot imagine what the *Gentleman* proposed to himself , when he wrote this extraordinary Piece. Was he asleep or awake ? Or was his Head seiz'd with a Fit of the Gout , which hinder'd him from Thinking ? Could he imagine that any Man of Sense in the *World* would believe him ? Or did he think his Reputation so well establish'd , that if he should tell People , that *Light is Darkneß* , they would take it for a Truth upon his bare *Word* ?

Surely the *Gentleman's* Overshooting himself in so exorbitant a Manner must be attributed to some such Cause. He says *the Pope's Supremacy is the only Article we are bound to believe explicitly ; as to others , it is no Matter , whether we believe them or not.* What , is it no Matter with us , whether we do or do not believe in God the Father , or in *Jesus-Christ his only*

Son ? Is it no Matter with us whether we do or do not believe the *blessed Trinity*, or the *Incarnation*, *Death*, and *Resurrection* of our Saviour Christ ! Why then do we teach Children the *Apostles Creed* as soon as they can speak, and tell them they must believe every Article of it under Pain of eternal Damnation, if it be no Matter whether they believe it or not ? But the Calumny is too gross to deserve a serious Answer.

Page 198. the Gentleman tells us, *there never was a Church call'd Catholick in the Sense of Rome ; that is, which was own'd by all other Churches as their Head.* If he means, which was own'd by *Hereticks* and *Schismatics* ; I grant there never was such a *Catholick Church*. But where will he find this to be the *Sense of Rome* ? When did the *Church of Rome* pretend to be a ridiculous Compound of all Sects ? Or declare, either that the *Catholick Church* was ever own'd by *Heretical* or *Schismatical Churches*, or that she ever own'd them as a Part of her Communion ? The Gentleman forgot here what he said before, viz. *that the Church of Rome by her Principles cannot communicate with any, who will not own her Supremacy.* Which utterly spoils his pretty Comparison of the *Church of Rome* to the Bed of *Procrustes*, to which some were made fit by being stretch'd out, and others by being cut shorter. For I do not see by what Contrivance either of *Cutting off*, or *Stretching out* he will ever make *Hereticks*, *Schismatics*, or Persons really *excommunicated* become Members of the *Church of Rome* : And if he do's not, his Comparison is void of Sense.

Of Unity.

Page 199. the Gentleman begins to speak of *Unity*, and accuses us *first* of not having *Unity of Faith*.

But how do's he prove it? He tells us *first*: we know not *where to place the Infallibility*. Tis very true his *Lordship* in the former Conversation knew no more than the *Gentleman* would let him: but he has now fully satisfied him in that Point, and mark'd out very plainly to him, where it is to be placed [1. Part. §. 51.] But *2dly*, he says, we do not agree, which *Articles of our Creed are to be believed explicitly*. Yet he told us Just now, that *the Pope's Supremacy is the only Article in our Creed to be believed explicitly*. How necessary is it for some Persons to have good Memories?

However to satisfy him as far as is necessary; we teach unanimously, that all are bound to do what they can to learn the *Apostle's Creed*, and have it explain'd to them; and then they are bound to believe every Article *explicitly*. Nor do I know any *Writer*, that excuses any one come to the Use of Reason from the Necessity of Believing *explicitly*, that there is *one God in three Persons*: that the *second Person became Man and died for us*: and that God is the *Rewarder of Virtue*, and *Punisher of Sin*. But over and above, we oblige them to believe in General all Truths reveal'd to the *Catholick Church*: which I think suffices to a perfect *Unity in Faith*. For otherwise whoever has not an *explicit* knowledge of all Truths whatsoever contain'd in the *whole Bible*, cannot be said to have an *entire Faith*, which is absurd. And the Absurdity of it shews, that the *Gentleman* himself as great an Enemy as he is to Believing *implicitly*, must sit down content with an *implicit Faith* of numberless reveal'd Truths.

But *2dly*, he taxes us page 200. with Want of *Unity in Love and Charity*: and proves it because there are *Disputes among Religious Orders*, and between *National and National Churches*. Whence he concludes,

cludes, that *Unity in outward Communion will avail us nothing*, nay it will not so much as denominate us *Christians*, far less to be the *only Christians in the World*, or the *Catholick Church*.

What a Number of Mistakes are here to be rectified? *First*, he supposes that Disputes about private Opinions must of Necessity cause a Breach of *Love and Charity*; which is a gross Mistake. For the *Apostles* themselves were not free from Disputes, yet I hope they were in *Charity* with one another. *2dly*, he supposes that our *Unity* consists meerly in an *outward Communion*; which is a grosser Mistake than the former. Because *inward Faith* is somewhat more than a meer *outward Communion*: and we admit none into the Church but such as declare they believe truly and sincerely the *whole Faith* reveal'd by God: *3dly*, he supposes a Church to be *unchristian'd* (if I may be allow'd to speak so) by some of her Members being void of *Love and Charity* to one another. Which if it be true, there will not be such a Thing as a *Christian Church* in the *World*. But *4thly*, he supposes we think ourselves the *only Christians in the World*; which is a downright Blunder. But to stave off from himself the imputation of it, and be at full Liberty to confute it, he fathers it upon his *Lordship* in the two Lines of *Nonsense* attributed to him pag. 198. where the noble Peer after a long Silence comes out with this wise Saying. *But we admit none others to be Christian Churches, who do not own it* (meaning the *Supremacy*) which is both false and absurd. For, tho it be true that we esteem ourselves the *only Catholicks* in the *World*, because the *Catholick Church* is essentially *One*, that is, in *One Communion* (or the *Nicene Creed* is false) yet we are far from Esteeming ourselves to be the *only Christians* in the *World*: And so we own that *Hereticks* and

Schismatics baptized and believing the Divinity of Christ are *Christians* ; yet we deny them to be *Catholicks*. As I own the *Gentleman* to be a *Christian*, but I will never own him to be a *Catholick*, unless he renounces his Errors.

Here then let us see, what Account the *Gentleman* gives of the *Church's Unity*. He distinguishes between a *perfect Unity*, and such a one as we are capable of in this our imperfect State. *Perfect Unity* (says he pag. 199.) is not only in outward Communion, that is, in being within the same Walls together, or in Subscribing to a Formula of Articles of Faith, half of which must be believed implicitly ; but an Unity likewise in Saving and Damning Principles, and Practices of Love and Charity, for which chiefly we shall be Judg'd at the last Day. If these be wanting the Unity will be very imperfect, and stand us in little Steed.

If by these last Words the *Gentleman* means no more, than that an outward Communion, and Profession of the same Faith suffices not to save the Members of that Communion, unless they be likewise united in Love and Charity, I am wholly of his Mind : because Faith alone or being a Member of the true Church suffices not to Salvation without the Observance of the *Commandements* : and the principal Commandement is that of *Charity* ; without which we may be Members of the true Church, but not true *Disciples of Christ* : that is, we may be sound in Faith, but very bad *Christians*.

But there lies a Snake in the Grass. For the *Gentleman* has dress'd up for us this fine System of Unity for no other End, than to explode the Belief of ONE holy *Catholick Church upon Earth*, and run down all Pretensions to it amongst Men. Because it is certain a Church cannot be One without Unity : and the Unity he has described is such, as can only be

found in *Heaven*, where there are no *Disputes*, and where all the Members of that happy Society are united in *perfect Love and Charity*. Whereas there is no Church upon Earth without Disputes about particular Opinions; and it is morally impossible, that in so vast a Body as the *Catholick Church* is upon Earth, all her Members should be united in *perfect Love and Charity*. Nay the Contrary is manifest from daily Experience.

Now that this was the *Gentleman's* main Drift in his Description of the *Church's Unity* is plain from his Words *pag. 202.* where he tells us, 1. that the Article of *one holy Catholick Church* was put but late into the *Creed*. Which he could not say for any other End than to vilify and discredit the Authority of that Article. 2. That the next Article (as he calls it, tho he owns it may be call'd a Part of the former) viz. *The Communion of Saints*, must be referr'd to *Heaven*, where only is the *Communion of Saints*. And the Reason he gives for this is, because in *Heaven* alone there is no Mixture of *Reprobates*, who (as he tells us) are but in *Appearance* Members of the *Church*.

From these two Principles he draws the following Conclusion. *Therefore the truly Catholick Church in Heaven is chiefly and principally meant by the holy Catholick Church, and the Communion of Saints in the Creed.* THERE (says he) is the great Body of the Church. There are but few at a Time upon Earth; and of them we know not, which belong to that truly Catholick Church or not. *pag. 202. 203.* But who then are the few, that are allow'd by him to belong to the *Catholick Church*? He tells us *pag. 202.* they are only the *ELECT*, who are not *Visible* upon Earth.

This is the *Gentleman's* Explanation of that Article of the *Creed*, which is concerning the *Catholick*

Church. But to detect as briefly as is possible the Falshood and Venom of it, I shall content myself with Setting down two Consequences, which follow manifestly from it. The first is, that the *true Church of Christ upon Earth* has always been *invisible* to us; since the *Elect*, of whom alone he says it is composed, are *not visible upon Earth*, according to his own Words.

Whence it follows 2dly, that it has always been impossible for any Man to apply himself to the *true Church* either for *Instruction*, or *Ordination*, or any of the *Sacraments*; which evacuates all *Episcopal* and *Pastoral* Authority. Because no Man can know, whether the *Bishops* or *Pastors*, to whom he would apply himself, be of the Number of the *Elect*: nor by Consequence, whether they be Members of the *true Church*. And is not this most curious Doctrine!

But the ancient Fathers never taught it. For they always understood the *Parable* proposed by *Christ* of the *Field*, wherein the *Wheat* and *Tares* grew, and were to grow together till the *Harvest*, Math. 13. v. 30. I say they always understood this *Parable* as a faithful Representation of the *present State* of the Church, wherein the *Good* and the *Wicked*, *Saints*, and *Sinners*, *Elect* and *Reprobate* live mix'd together, and will do so till the Day of Judgment. And therefore when the *Catholick Church* on Earth is call'd the *Communion of Saints*, the Meaning of it is not, that all the Members of it are *Saints*, but that she is the only *Communion* upon Earth, in which there are *Saints*.

But the Gentleman asks, what *Unity* has that Church, wherein the *Elect* and *Reprobate* are mix'd together? I answer, she has the *Unity of Faith*, the *Unity of Sacraments*, and the *Communion* of all her Members united under one *Head*. And this is absolutely necessary to constitute *one Church*. Tho this alone suf-

fices not to Salvation, but the Leading a good Life, being united in Charity, and keeping the Commandments is likewise required.

However since the *Gentleman* has already given us a Description of such a *perfect Unity*, as the Church on Earth can never be capable of; let us now See, what Sort of *Unity* he will allow her. It is all reduced to this one single Point. viz. *That as all the Nations in the World, tho at War together, are one Kingdom to God, so all Christian Churches upon Earth, tho not one of them should communicate with the other, are one Church to Christ.* pag. 200. 201. This is the Substance of his Discourse in the two Pages quoted; and this is all the *Unity* he allows as essential to the *Catholick Church* in her present imperfect State. The true meaning whereof is this. viz. that as *Christians, Jews, Pagans, and Mahometans* make *one World*, so *Catholicks, Hereticks, and Schismaticks* (provided they be *Christians*, for he makes no Difference between *Christians* and *Catholicks*) make *one Church*. Or thus. *As all Nations in the World, tho at War together, are one Kingdom to God; so all Churches in the World, tho they be Hereticks or Schismaticks, tho they disagree in all Things but the Belief of common Christianity, and excommunicate and bite and devour one another, are that one Catholick Church upon Earth, which we profess in the Creed.* If this be not monstrous Doctrine, I know not what is.

But what was it, that made the *Gentleman* give into this extravagant Notion of the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church* upon Earth? He had two Reasons for it to the best of my Conjecture. First, because he could not sufficiently enlarge the Bounds of his own Church, but by incorporating it with the whole Ristraf of *Heretical Christians* upon Earth in such a Manner, as to make them all appear to be but one

Church, or *Mystical Body of Christ*. And 2dly, because he could not make his own Communion be a Part of the *Catholick Church* by any other Stratum, than by making the Belief of *common Christianity* sufficient to render any upstart *Heretical* or *Schismatical* Communion a Branch of that Church.

But the *Gentleman* objects pag. 203. that if the aforesaid Article relating to the *Catholick Church* had been meant in our Sense, it must have been worded, *the Roman Catholick Church*. And since it is only call'd the *Catholick Church*, he concludes, it extends to all *Christian Churches*, which make up the *Catholick Church upon Earth* in such an Unity, as our *fallen State* will bear. Here then all *Hereticks* and *Schismatics* whatsoever are by the *Gentleman's* comprehensive Charity once more adopted Members of the *Catholick Church*, as being united together as well as our *fallen State* will bear. That is to say (according to the *Gentleman's* true System of *Church-Unity*) like Nations that are at War, and Cutting one anothers Throats as fast as they can.

But the grand Difficulty is yet unanswer'd; viz. why the Church is not call'd the *Roman Catholick Church* in the *Creed*? I hope the Reader will not take it ill, if I answer this frivolous Objection seriously. For if I did not, it might for ought I know be adopted into the Number of *Protestant unanswerables*; and it deserves it as well as many more that have been cry'd up for such.

The Reason therefore, why the Word *Roman* is not inserted into the Article concerning the Church is, because nothing but the *essential Attributes* of the Church are mention'd in the *Creed*. Now tho *Catholick* and *Roman Catholick* be synonymous *de facto*, it is not essential to the *Catholick Church*, that her *supreme Head and Governour* should have his *Episco-*

pal See fix'd at *Rome*. For, if *St Peter* had fix'd his Episcopal See immoveably at *Antioch*, then instead of *Roman*, she might have been call'd the *Antiochean Catholick Church*. So that the Word *Roman* expresses no essential Attribute of the Church: but only marks out the Place, where her *Visible Head* with whom all are bound to communicate has his Episcopal Seat.

Of private Judgment.

PAGES 204. 205. 206. 207. contain a Summary of every Thing the *Gentleman* has said against Submitting our private Reason to *Church-Authority*. The Reader will find it fully answer'd [1. Part. §. 26. 33. 37. 51.] where he will see the Reasons, why a Person thoroughly convinced that he has found the *true Church of Christ*, cannot act rationally but in submitting his *private Reason* to her Decisions in Things, which are above the Reach of his Understanding. This the *Gentleman* has taken a *World* of Pains to ridicule. He calls it *putting out our Eyes, extinguishing the Lamp of Reason*, and what not? As if a Man acted contrary to Reason in not thinking himself wiser than the whole *Catholick Church*, and Paying a Submission when Reason itself obliges him to it.

Thus has he set up the Standard of perpetual *Schism* and *Rebellion* against the Church of God, by Authorizing each Man's private Reason to controll her Decisions and Ordonances, whenever he shall be vain enough to think her in the *Wrong* and himself in the *Right*. Nay he says positively p. 205. that to do otherwise will condemn us at the last Day. And do's not this subject the Church of God to the Caprice of every private Person? Do's it not pervert the whole Order of Ecclesiastical Government,

and render both *Faith* and *Discipline* precarious? Can such Doctrine have any other Tendency than to establish *Deism* and *Free-thinking* upon the Ruines of all reveal'd Religion? Truly if *Popery* cannot be attack'd but with such pernicious Principles as these, an unprejudiced Reader must conclude whether he will or not, that it has Truth on it's Side.

But can any Doctrine have *Truth on it's Side*, that has *Reason against it*? No, it cannot. But it may have *Truth on it's Side*, tho it be *above Reason*: and he, who sees no Difference betwixt a Thing being *against* and *above Reason*, is ignorant of the very Alphabet of reveal'd Religion. As for Example, I hope the Gentleman will not question, but that the Mystery of the *Blessed Trinity* has *Truth on it's Side*. Yet it is infinitely *above* the Comprehension of all human Reason. But has it then *Reason against it*? No surely. For *Reason* can never be *against Truth*. And hence it follows, that tho this Mystery be *above Reason*, a Man must be void of Sense and Reason not to submit his *private Judgment* to a firm Belief of it. And this alone is a full Confutation of every Thing the Gentleman has said to lampoon and ridicule our Submitting to the Decisions of the *Catholick Church* in Things that are above our Reason. Nay I chalenge any Man, that either believes the *blessed Trinity*, or the *Incarnation and Death of Christ*, or the *Propagation of Original Sin*, or any other such *incomprehensible Mystery*, to give a solid Answer to it.

What the Gentleman says pag. 205. is remarkable. To refuse (says he) the Assistance of a Church, because she is not infallible, is depriving ourselves of a Means, which God has appointed; and is the same Perversness, as if we should refuse to consult a Lawyer or Physician, because it is possible he may err in his Judgment.

How extremely tender and wary is this Expression,

tion to refuse the Assistance of a Church? Surely the Gentleman had some Check of Conscience upon him, when he wrote this Piece. For why would he not speak out boldly? Why would he thus mince the Matter instead of Saying, *to refuse to HEAR THE CHURCH*? I presume the Reason was, because it would have put the Reader in Mind of our Saviour's Saying, *if he do's not HEAR THE CHURCH, let him be unto thee as a Heathen and a Publican.* Math. 18. v. 17. Which imports nothing less, than that we are bound under Pain of eternal Damnation to hearken to the Voice of the Church, and learn the Truth of her: And this would have spoil'd his darling Maxim; that we must trust to private Judgment in every Thing without Exception.

But let that be as it will: I ask the Gentleman, which of all the fallible Churches it is, to whose Assistance we must have Recourse as a Means which God has appointed? The Reason of my Question is, because his Principles of private Judgment and common Christianity make one Church as good as another as to the Business of Salvation, provided it be but a Christian Church. However Since I cannot question, but he gives the Preference to the Church of England, as being not only a Member, but Minister of it; suppose now I should make Choice of this Church to have Recourse to for Assistance, I ask how far I must trust her? To be sure, if his Principle of private Judgment be worth a Rush, I must trust her no farther than my Eyes can see, or my Reason can understand; which is but a course Complement to his Church: for Ile trust a Porter or Cartman as far as that comes to. And if we trust her any farther, if we believe upon her Authority Things, we cannot understand or comprehend (which the Gentleman calls implicit Faith) then he tells us pag. 205. That this is

abandoning both Sense and Reason which God gave us as a Guide, and therefore will require it of us. And this only is that, which will render us self-condemn'd and bear Witness against us at the last Day. The true English whereof is, that whoever do's not follow his own private Reason preferably to the Judgment of the Church, will be damn'd for it. Most excellent Doctrine!

However to Justify this dreadful Sentence, having told us before, that to refuse the Assistance of a Church because she is not infallible is the same as Refusing to consult a Lawyer or Physician because it is possible he may err, he continues thus. But tho I allow their Skill to be better than mine in their several Professions, yet we still keep to ourselves so much Use of our Reason that if it were Poison, the Physician were Going to give me, I would not take it: And there are Things so plain, that no Lawyer shall persuade me. Much more ought we to be careful in our eternal Concerns, and not to give ourselves up implicitly to any whatsoever. That if they should direct us against the express Commands in Scriptures, or the Dictates of Reason and common Morality, or bid us deny all our Senses we must acquiesce without Examining. pag. 205.

It is not to be doubted, but this Piece is to be understood with Relation to any Church upon Earth: so that the true Church of Christ (in whatever Communion it be) is comprehended in the Caution it contains; and we are here most pathetically exhorted to beware of Placing too great a Confidence in the Wisdom even of that Church, which Christ has establish'd to be our Guide to Heaven, to which he has promised his perpetual Assistance, and which St Paul calls the Pillar and Ground of Truth.

'Tis true indeed the Gentleman is so modest as to suppose her to be a fallible Church, to give some Co-

lour both to the Mistrust we ought to have of her, and to this sly Insinuation, viz. that she is capable of *Directing us against the most express Commands in Scriptures, of teaching a Doctrine contrary to the Dictates of Reason and common Morality, and Bidding us to deny all our Senses*; by which he means, *Obliging us not to use them according to the establish'd Order of Providence*. And the Result of all is, that whensoever our *private Reason* (which to be sure is more clearighted than the *Church of Christ*) has the Presumption to tell us, that she is guilty of any of these *impious Absurdities*, we are then bound under Pain of eternal Damnation not to give ourselves up to her, but to follow our *private Judgment* in Opposition to her.

And will the *Gentleman* after this pretend to bring either a *Jew* or *Deist* over to the *Catholick Church*? If he do's, they need but read to him his own *Case stated*, where-ever he stands up in Defence of *private Judgment* against *Church-Authority*, and they will maintain their Ground in Spite of him, and run him down with his own Principles. For they will both tell him, that according to his own Rule they cannot in Conscience embrace the *Catholick Faith*: because their own *Reason*, which he says they are bound to follow under Pain of eternal Damnation, convinces them, that *his Church* and the *New Testament*, the Authority of both which they equally despise, teaches a *Doctrine contrary to all the Dictates of common Sense and Reason*; As, that *the immortal God became a mortal Man, and died an ignominious Death*: and that *three are one*.

Nay the *Jew* will moreover tell him, that his *Church directs her Children against the express Commands of God in holy Scriptures*, by Obliging them to keep the *Sunday* holy instead of *Saturday*, which is

the Day peremptorily commanded in *Scripture* to be kept holy : and I defy the *Gentleman* to give a satisfactory Answer to the *Jew's* Objection against this Point of *Discipline*, unless he first retracts all he has said to vilify the *Church's Authority*, and pulls down the proud *Idol* of private Judgement, he has set up against her. Whence it appears, that a Member of the *Church of England* can neither argue against *Popery* without Furnishing *Jews* and *Deists* with Arms against *Christianity*, nor argue solidly for *Christianity* against *Jews* and *Deists* but from the very Principles he ridicules, when *Popery* is the Question.

I cannot quit this Subject without taking Notice of the pretty Colouring the *Gentleman* gives to the Presumption of one Opposing his *private Reason* against the solemn Decisions of the *Catholick Church*. He compares it with the rational Conduct of a Man, that refuses to take the *Poison*, his *Physician* is going to give him. Which is both a charitable Insinuation, that the *Church of Rome* is this unskilful or wicked *Physician*, and a general Caution to all Men not to trust the *Church* too far ; because she may give them *Poison* instead of *wholesome Food*. A most noble Character of the *Church of God* !

But, to retort his own Comparison upon him, suppose a Patient should have a strong Fancy, that the *Potion* his *Physician* is going to give him is *Poison*, and a thousand skilful experienced and consciencious *Physicians* should assure him, that it is not *Poison* but a most excellent Remedy, which will certainly cure him, would not such an obstinate and conceited Coxcomb be a Self-murderer, if he should die for Want of taking it ?

Now this is a faithful Representation of the Case between the *Catholick Church*, and a single Person opposing his *private Judgment* against her solemn

Decisions. And this was the very Case in the Beginning of the pretended Reformation between the *Church of Rome* on the one Hand, and the *first Reformer* on the other. Only with this Difference, that instead of a Thousand, he had Millions against him. For all the *World* knows, that the Faith he oppos'd was then, and had been profess'd by whole Christendom for many Ages; that it had been attested by undoubted Miracles in all the converted Nations under the Sun, and water'd with the Blood of innumerable Martyrs. So that the whole Question between the *Church of Rome* and the *Reform'd Churches* may be reduced to this one single Point: viz. whether it be more probable, that *whole Christendom* had been under a continual Dorage for many Ages together, or that the *first Reformer* was in the Wrong? I think the Decision of this Question is obvious to common Sense: and the Consequence of it is, that the *Reform'd Churches* have no better Security for their eternal Salvation, than a Man has, who has the Odds of Millions to one against him. Because their Religion can be no better now than it was at first: and it had Millions to one against it at first; as both *Luther* and *Calvin* own'd, when they first set up for *Reformers*. Let the *Gentleman* Judge by this how good a Cause he is imbark'd in, and how safe the Bottom is, upon which he ventures his Souls Salvation.

He tells us pag. 207. that *Truth is never afraid: for the more it is canvass'd, the brighter it appears*. But I doubt whether this will hold even in all *natural Truths*. For I think it is pretty clear, that there is such a Thing as *Motion*. Yet *Zeno* canvass'd the Nature of it so long till it turn'd his Head, and he denied the very Possibility of it: which plainly shews the narrow Compass of Man's Understanding.

Now if this be so even in some *natural Truths*, it is impossible it should be otherwise in *Mysteries*, which are most certainly above the Reach of our Understanding. Have not *Toland* and *Whiston* canvass'd the *Trinity*, till they have canvass'd themselves out of all Belief of it? And have not the *Arians* and *Socinians* also canvass'd the *Divinity of Christ*, till they have canvass'd themselves into downright *Blasphemy* against it? Yet I presume these are very certain *Truths*: But they are Truths of such a Nature, as are not to be attain'd to by the Canvassing of *human Reason*, but by an humble Submission.

The Gentleman adds, *it is strange to see those, who pretend to such an Assurance as is infallible, and yet seek to avoid the Light of Reason, as if afraid of being detected.* He might as well say, it is strange that they, who have a *bright Sunshine* to see by, should not trust to the deceitful Light of an *ignis fatuus*, as if afraid of being detected: which insinuation is both groundless and malicious. For tho the *Catholick Church* be *infallible* under the Directions of the *Divine Spirit*, she knows that a Man, who follows his own *private Judgment* in Matters of Religion, has a *Fool* for his Guide. Which makes her afraid not of the *Light*, but of the *Weakness* of *human Reason*: as Men are afraid to look at the Sun, not out of Mistrust of it's Brightness, but for Fear of Hurting their own Eyes by Gazing at it. Tho, to speak properly, submitting our *private Judgment* to an *Authority*, which God himself has appointed to be our *Guide*, is not *Avoiding*, but *Following the Light of Reason* in the Manner we are directed to do. And therefore *Faith* is always *rational*. Because nothing can be more *rational*, than to follow a Guide of God's own Appointment; and to submit our *private Reason*, when he requires it of us. [Vide 1. Part. §. 51.]

However the Gentleman will needs have it , that we are afraid of being detected. And why so ? Because the Canon-law forbids Laicks to dispute about Religion. Ibid. But what is it we should fear to be detected in ? What Secrets would such Disputes discover, which cannot be made known otherwise ? Has the Gentleman in his Case stated, where he was Matter of the Field, discover'd any Secrets we knew not before ? Surely he affects to be Mysterious, and drop ambiguous Words in Hopes the Ignorant will mistake them for profound Sense. For who will suspect he should not have Penetration enough to see, that a just Diffidence of the Incapacity of the Laity to manage controversial Disputes is a much better Reason for the Prohibition he Speaks of , than a Chimerical Fear of I know not what ; and I dare say he knows not what he means himself ? Unless he means that the common Laity may be more easily imposed upon by Misrepresentations , Forgery , and Slander than our learned Clergy. He was certainly at a very great Plunge , when he was forced to pick up such Stuff as this.

But let us see, if what follows be any Thing better. If Reason could be heard, it would make it very obvious to you (speaking to his Lordship) that in all the Points before mention'd the Certainty is on our Side, and the Doubt at least on yours. pag. 207. Most stoutly said ! Just so spoke Martin Luther, when he stood alone against Millions. It is certain (said he) I have my Doctrine from Heaven. Tom. 2. Fol. 333. And he had the same Foundation to build his Certainty upon, as the Gentleman has : viz. his own private Reason. For all the visible Authority upon earth was against him.

But what is it , that makes the Gentleman so very uppish , as to think it obvious to any, that the Cer-

certainty of Salvation is on his Side? For Example (says he) none make a Doubt, but that we may lawfully pray to God, and not before an Image of him, or without the Worship or Invocation of any Saint join'd with him: and so of all the rest. But on your Part, if what I have said makes them not appear unlawful to your Lordship, yet they must remain at least doubtful, till some stronger Evidence be produced for them, than has hitherto been given.

This with the Gentleman's good Leave is Begging the Question: for I can faithfully assure him, that all he has said against any Article either of our Faith or Discipline is of so little Weight, that his Lordship's Certainty of having the Truth on his Side is not in the least diminish'd by it.

But (says he) they must remain at least doubtful, till some stronger Evidence be produced for them, than has hitherto been given. If he means some stronger Evidence, than has been given in the Case stated of his own Cooking; I grant he has all the Reason in the World to complain, that the Evidence his Lordship has there produced for the Doctrine and Discipline of his Church, is not at all satisfactory. But I hope he has given him some better Satisfaction in the present Conversation. And if the Gentleman will not shut his Eyes, nor despise his Adversary, because he had him once in *Leading-strings*, he may now find that *stronger Evidence*, for which he seems to be in Quest.

Now as to the Example he produces to prove the Certainty of Salvation to be on his Side, viz. *that none can make a Doubt, but that we may lawfully pray to God, and not before an Image of him, or without the Worship or Invocation of any Saint join'd with him, and so of the rest.* I answer, this is the third Repetition of the same Argument. Tho (as fond as the Gentleman appears to be of it) it serves only to cut the

the Throat of his own Church ; as I have fully shew'd in my former Answers to it. But since he is resolved to give an Air of Importance to it by the meer Dint of Repetition (For who will suspect a *Doctor* in *Israel* should be capable of repeating insignificant Trifles) I must beg the Reader's Leave to trouble him also with a Repetition of my Answer to it.

Let us then see , whether the *Gentleman* has not by this Argument furnish'd the *Dissenters* with Stones to throw at him. For suppose a *Presbyterian* or *Fanatick* should argue thus. *None can make a Doubt but that we may lawfully baptize without the Sign of the Cross , or receive the Communion Sitting : or that it is lawful for us neither to use the Common Prayer Book, nor Surplices , nor Organs , nor consecrate Churches , nor keep holy Days for Saints and Angels , and so of the rest.* Suppose , I say , a *Dissenter* should argue in this Manner , must not the *Gentleman* (unless he will renounce his Argument against us) allow him to conclude from it , that *Presbyterians* and *Fanaticks* , who abhor all the aforesaid *Popish Ceremonies* , and think they have unanswerable Reasons against them, have the *Certainty of Salvation on their Side* ? However I appeal to his own Judgment , whether he would not have a very ill Opinion of the Religion of any of his *Bishops* or *Parsons* , who should baptize without the *Sign of the Cross* , or lay aside the common *Prayer-book* , or abolish the aforesaid *holy Days* , and so of the rest ? And why so ? Let him give a Reason for it if he can , that will not likewise condemn the first *English Reformers* , and utterly spoil the *Certainty* he pretends to on Account , that his Church neither uses *Images* , nor *prays before them* , nor *invokes the Saints* , and so of the Rest.

Wherefore my direct Answer to the Example produced by the *Gentleman* is this. *viz.* that tho it

be lawful to Pray to God and not before an Image of him, or without the Worship or Invocation of any Saints join'd with him, yet it is always unlawful to set up the Standard of Rebellion against the Church. It is unlawful to disobey *superior Powers*, when they command nothing that is contrary to the Law of God. For *they who resist Powers resist God*, and acquire Damnation to themselves, if St Paul is to be believed. Finally 'tis unlawful to raise *Schisms* for Things that are indifferent in themselves, And to omit any publick Duty in Contempt of the Authority that commands it, is always a criminal Omision. And these are the Crimes, with which the *first Reformers* stand charged before God: as likewise they, who walk in the Footsteps of such rebellious Forefathers, and continue the *Schism* which they began upon the same frivolous and unjust Pretexts. Yet 'tis upon this rotten Foundation the *Certainty*, the *Gentleman* boasts of, is built. Much Good may it do him.

I find nothing in the four last Pages of his *Case stated* but a Repetition of Repetitions relating to the *Supremacy* and *private Judgment*. It seems he had it not in his Power to take Leave of his *Lordship* without giving the *Pope* a Parting Blow, and Complementing once more his own dear *private Reason*. I hope however I have said some Things, that may help to cure him of his Fondness of it.

THE CONTENTS

of the second Part.

§. 1.

OF the Virtue and Efficacy of the Sacraments;
Pag. 1

§. 2.

Of Beads. p. 10

§. 3.

Of Blessings and Consecrations. p. 12

§. 4.

Of the Sign of the Croß, holy Water, and Exorcisms.
p. 18

§. 5.

Invocation of Saints. p. 21

§. 6.

St Paul to the Colossians 2. v. 18. 19. misrepresented
by the Gentleman. p. 29

§. 7.

The Difference between a Mediator of Redemption, and
a Mediator of Intercession. p. 39

§. 8.

St Austin falsified. p. 44

§. 9.

The scandalous Parallel between the heathen Worship,
and that of Roman Catholicks confuted. p. 47

§. 10.

Of Dividing the Commandments. p. 54

	§. 11.	
<i>The Confutation of the Parallel continued.</i>		P. 57
	§. 12.	
<i>Of supposititious Saints.</i>		P. 71
	§. 13.	
<i>Of Devotion to the Blessed Virgin.</i>		P. 75
	§. 14.	
<i>The B. Virgin not put upon the Level with Christ.</i>		
P. 79		
	§. 15.	
<i>The Index expurgatorius examined.</i>		P. 87
	§. 16.	
<i>Of Reliques.</i>		P. 91
	§. 17.	
<i>Of Images.</i>		P. 97
	§. 18.	
<i>The Church of England guilty of Incoherency.</i>		P. 100
	§. 19.	
<i>The Subject of Images resumed.</i>		P. 103
	§. 20.	
<i>Concerning Images of God.</i>		P. 107
	§. 21.	
<i>Of Heathen Idols, and the golden Calf.</i>		P. 114
	§. 22.	
<i>Of Transubstantiation.</i>		P. 124
	§. 23.	
<i>Transubstantiation proved from the Words of the Institution.</i>		P. 127
	§. 24.	
<i>Neither Reason nor Religion obliges us to Judge always according to the Information of our Senses.</i>		P. 137
	§. 25.	
<i>Christ's Body and Blood are both really, and in a spiritual Manner present in the Sacrament.</i>		P. 144
	§. 26.	
<i>Objections from the Fathers answer'd.</i>		P. 152

T H E C O N T E N T S. 365

§. 27.	
<i>The Gentleman's unseasonable Boasting.</i>	p. 169
§. 28.	
<i>Some Animadversions upon Dr Cofin's History of Transubstantiation.</i>	p. 172
§. 29.	
<i>The Antiquity of the Doctrine of Transubstantiation.</i>	
p. 179.	
§. 30.	
<i>Transubstantiation not repugnant to the Principles of Philosophy.</i>	p. 183
§. 31.	
<i>Of implicit Faith.</i>	p. 188
§. 32.	
<i>No Danger of Idolatry from the Adoration of Christ in the Sacrament.</i>	p. 190
§. 33.	
<i>Of School-distinctions.</i>	p. 194
§. 34.	
<i>Some Touches of the Gentleman's Skill in Drollery and Slander.</i>	p. 202
§. 35.	
<i>Transubstantiation as ancient as Christianity.</i>	p. 208
§. 36.	
<i>Of the Worship of the Croß, and Images of Christ.</i>	
p. 216	
§. 37.	
<i>Some Touches of prophane Burlesque.</i>	p. 223
§. 38.	
<i>Of Concomitancy, and Communion in one kind.</i>	p. 232
§. 39.	
<i>Lay-Communion in one or both kinds is a Point of Discipline only, and neither forbid, nor commanded by Christ.</i>	p. 240
§. 40.	
<i>The Decree of the Council of Constance concerning Com-</i>	

<i>munion in one kind is not contrary to Christ's Institution, nor the Faith of the primitive Church.</i>	p. 248
§. 41.	
<i>Some sophistical Remarks upon the 6th Chapter of Saint John answer'd.</i>	p. 257
§. 42.	
<i>Of Celibacy, or the single Life of Priests.</i>	p. 264
§. 43.	
<i>Objections answer'd.</i>	p. 268
§. 44.	
<i>Other Objections answer'd.</i>	p. 275
§. 45.	
<i>Of Purgatory.</i>	p. 284
§. 46.	
<i>Of Tradition.</i>	p. 291
§. 47.	
<i>The subject of Purgatory resumed.</i>	p. 295
§. 48.	
<i>Of Merits.</i>	p. 300
§. 49.	
<i>Objections answer'd</i>	p. 307
§. 50.	
<i>Praying for the Relief of the Dead has been the constant Practice of the Catholick Church.</i>	p. 318
§. 51.	
<i>Some Remarks upon the Gentleman's Performance.</i>	p. 323.
§. 52.	
<i>Of the Liturgy in Latin.</i>	p. 326
<i>The Postscript, containing some Remarks upon the Gentleman's Conclusion in the former Conversation.</i>	p. 335.



